WILLIAM O. GARDNER

~~Calvin R. Stewart.~~

H 28

2 00/c

88BE-GA
M-17

H

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL

HAND-BOOK

TO THE

EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

BY

HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, TH.D.,

OBERCONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FIFTH EDITION OF THE GERMAN BY

G. H. VENABLES.

WITH A PREFACE, TRANSLATION OF REFERENCES, AND SUPPLEMENTARY
NOTES TO THE AMERICAN EDITION BY

HENRY E. JACOBS, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE EVANGELICAL
LUTHERAN CHURCH AT PHILADELPHIA, AND LATE PROFESSOR OF THE
GREEK LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, PENNSYLVANIA
COLLEGE, GETTYSBURG, PA.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY.
NEW YORK AND LONDON.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1884,
By FUNK & WAGNALLS,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D.C.

PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION.

"The Epistle to the Galatians is my epistle. I have betrothed myself to it. It is my wife." These words of Luther express most forcibly the relation of the first epistle treated in this volume to the great struggles whereby Protestant Christianity came into being as the revivification of the pure gospel taught by St. Paul. The doctrine of justification by faith alone without works, the *articulus vel stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*, is its great theme, which is unfolded with matchless skill and defended with intensest ardor against the various perversions so abundant in modern Christianity, that had already manifested themselves in apostolic days. Luther's own commentary of 1519, of which John Bunyan said: "I do prefer this book of Martin Luther upon the Galatians, excepting the Holy Bible, before all books that I have ever seen, as most fit for a wounded conscience," owes all its power to the high degree with which Luther has caught the spirit of Paul, and applies his argument, with the same earnestness to the relations of a later time. It should be a matter of special gratitude, that, however fierce the battle waged over some of the other epistles of Paul, the authenticity of this epistle, which pertains to the very centre of our faith, is all but universally conceded, only one writer (Bruno Baur), and that one not of very high repute, having ventured to question it, and that, too, on assumptions that can be instantly answered. The entire theory of salvation by faith *and* works, which modern Pelagianism would introduce into Protestantism, is at once met in unmistakable words, as well as, also, the suggestion that original Christianity was legalistic until St. Paul introduced the new element of evangelical freedom, since this epistle asserts so emphatically the harmony between the apostles.

The epistle to the Ephesians, belonging to a later period, when the apostle was forcibly restrained from engaging in the active prosecution of his life work, admits us into some of the great thoughts that engaged his meditations. While bearing the true Pauline type, and constantly urging the same great phase of Christian doctrine, with his characteristic ardor, in the depths into which it penetrates, and the constant connection made between practical themes and the highest mysteries of faith, it approaches above the other epistles of St. Paul the modes of thought and reasoning found in St. John. Its long and involved sentences recall the Epistle to the Romans, and remind us how inadequate the earthly vessels to contain the abundance of divine revelation committed to them. Its entire theme is found in ch. i. 20–23—viz., that Christ is the centre and goal of all things to His church. From this standpoint the development is so thorough, and extends over so vast a compass, that in weighing the words of the epistle we are brought into the closest contact with the most profound mysteries connected with almost every article of revelation. The full discussion of the more important terms employed in this epistle would, if systematically arranged, form almost a complete body of doctrine.

We doubt whether in any of his commentaries the peculiar excellences of Meyer as an expositor display themselves with better effect than in this volume. His simplicity, general clearness, thorough acquaintance with everything pertaining to the text of the Scriptures, astonishing industry in the study, collection, and condensation of the labor of all important writers of all ages, languages, and confessions on the topics treated, characteristic candor in expressing his doubts concerning difficulties that confronted him, and in even criticising and correcting his own statements in former editions, are nowhere more apparent. However mistaken we may at times regard his judgment, we must ever hold in high esteem his work, as a handbook for scholars, that in its sphere is without a rival. Traces of the rationalistic opinions with which he started, but from which, as years of study followed, he was gradually delivered, are to be found in his comments on these epistles. Such is, for example, the low view which he takes of inspiration, and the consequent undervaluing of the trustworthiness of the Book of Acts, leading to a very ready solution, on his part, of seeming contradictions, by deciding that St. Luke was, of course, incorrect. In several passages the subordination of the Son to the Father is maintained. Christological mysteries find a too ready explanation by the introduction of conceptions circumscribing our Lord with local limitations, even in the hidden glory in which He has entered. Man's natural estate is denied to be one in which He is actually beneath God's anger. By birth he is not a child of wrath, but becomes such by the development of innate principles of evil, in opposition to the moral will inclining to what is good, wherewith he is also endowed. This result, however, inevitably follows in every one "who lives long enough to be able to sin." Man's powers are only impaired, not dead with respect to spiritual things. It would be very unjust, however, to at once apply to our author the terms by which the advocates of such errors are ordinarily designated in the history of doctrines and heresies. They are not developed in Meyer with any consistency. He seems often to recoil from the conclusions to which his premises lead, while the entire method and line of argument pursued show how the subtile and pervasive poison of earlier life is gradually being expelled by the ever closer contact of the author with the great thoughts of eternity.

The work of the American editor has been, first, to make such changes in the Edinburgh translation as seemed to be required by the English idiom. Not many passages were found where an emendation was deemed necessary. A second task was to transfer to the footnotes most of such references as were unessential to the sense contained in the text. In this way we think that the commentary has been made much more readable. Where references have been retained in the text, there has generally been some reason for it. Thirdly, the great body of quotations from foreign languages have been translated. Exceptions have occurred, as on p. 464, Note 1, and p. 468, Note 6, where the force of the quotation is found in the very words employed, or their order, rather than in the thought conveyed. Several passages have been allowed to stand without a translation for euphemistic reasons. Fourthly, the text of the translation has been compared with the revised Meyer, and all changes made by the editors noted. The original intention was to embody them all in the notes. This, however, was soon seen to be impossible in the compass of the twenty-eight pages allowed us. Dr. Friedrich Sieffert, of Erlangen, who has edited the volume on Galatians, as the Sixth Edition of Meyer, Göttingen, 1880, has so thoroughly wrought over the material in Meyer's own last edition, with so much scholarly independence, and so many omissions, additions, and arguments taking exception to Meyer, that the result may almost be regarded an entirely new commentary prepared on the basis of Meyer. On the contrary, Dr. W. Schmidt, of Leipzig, in the Fifth Edition of the Commentary on Ephesians, Göttingen, 1878, has confined himself almost entirely to the work of an editor, and made only a very few changes. It has been our aim, accordingly, to include in our notes only the more important variations from Meyer in these later editions, and to these to add such other notes, selected and original, as we thought might serve the purposes of the students into whose hands this volume would fall. In many of these notes we have had in view the indication of what we believed to be important errors in our revered author. Fifthly, additions have been made to the critical apparatus prefaced to each chapter, mostly from the revised German Meyer above mentioned. These we did not deem it necessary in all cases to indicate, the effort being simply to preserve intact all the comments. The references to Winer's New Testament Grammar are to the Seventh German Edition; and as Prof. Thayer's American edition indicates the paging of this edition on the margin, the references to the Edinburgh edition in the translation we have revised were erased.

Special acknowledgments are due Rev. G. F. Behringer, of Brooklyn, N. Y., whose scholarly attainments we have long known, and who has exercised the same careful supervision over this volume as it passed through the press that he has given the other volumes of the series.

We can only regret that our portion of work had to be performed amidst the distraction of numerous other engagements, and without either time or space for such thorough editing as would fulfil our ideal. Every hour spent on it has been one of mingled pleasure and profit.

HENRY E. JACOBS.

PHILADELPHIA, *October 15th*, 1884.

PREFATORY NOTE BY THE EDITOR.

Some account of the circumstances in which this translation has been undertaken, of the plan adopted in preparing it, and of the abbreviations used throughout, will be found prefixed to the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, which also contains a Preface specially written by Dr. Meyer for the English edition of his work.

It is unnecessary here to repeat the explanations there given except in so far as they concern the course which I have followed in presenting to the English reader Dr. Meyer's work without subtraction or addition. In reproducing so great a masterpiece of exegesis, I have not thought it proper to omit any part of its discussions or of its references—however little some of these may appear likely to be of interest or use to English scholars—because an author such as Dr. Meyer is entitled to expect that his work shall not be tampered with, and I have not felt myself at liberty to assume that the judgment of others as to the expediency of any omission would coincide with my own. Nor have I deemed it necessary to append any notes of dissent from, or of warning against, the views of Dr. Meyer, even where these are decidedly at variance with opinions which I hold. Strong representations were made to me that it was desirable to annex to certain passages notes designed to counteract their effects; but it is obvious that, if I had adopted this course in some instances, I should have been held to accept or approve the author's views in other cases, where I had not inserted any such *caveat*. The book is intended for, and can in fact only be used with advantage by, the professional scholar. Its general exegetical excellence far outweighs its occasional doctrinal defects; and in issuing it without note or comment, I take for granted that the reader will use it, as he ought, with discrimination. The English commentaries of Bishop Ellicott, Dr. Lightfoot, and Dr. Eadie serve admirably from different points of view—philological, historical, doctrinal—to supplement and, when necessary, to correct it; as does also the American edition of the Commentary in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, translated and largely augmented under the superintendence of Dr. Schaff.

The translation of the present volume has been executed with care by

Mr. Venables, and remains in substance his work; but, as I have revised it throughout and carried it through the press, it is only due to him that I should share the responsibility of the form in which it appears. In translating a work of this nature, the value of which mainly consists in the precision and subtlety of its exegesis, it is essential that there should be a close and careful reproduction of the form of the original; but, in looking over the sheets, I find not a few instances in which the desire to secure this fidelity has led to an undue retention of German idiom. This, I trust, may be less apparent in the volumes that follow.

In such a work it is difficult, even with great care, to avoid the occurrence of misprints, several of which have been observed by Mr. Venables and myself in glancing over the sheets. Minor errors, such as the occasional misplacing of accents, it has not been thought necessary formally to correct. We have taken the opportunity of correcting in the translation various misprints found in the original. The commentator referred to in the text as "Ambrose" (from his work on the Pauline Epistles being frequently printed with the works of that Father) ought to have been designated, as in the critical notes, "Ambrosiaster," and is usually identified with Hilary the Deacon.

I subjoin a note of the exegetical literature of the Epistle, which may be found useful.

W. P. D.

Glasgow College, *May*, 1873.

EXEGETICAL LITERATURE OF THE EPISTLE.

[For commentaries embracing the whole New Testament, see Preface to the Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew ; for those which deal with the Pauline, or Apostolic, Epistles generally, see Preface to the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. The following list includes only those which concern the Epistle to the Galatians in particular, or in which that Epistle holds the first place on the title-page. Works mainly of a popular or practical character have not in general been included, since, however valuable they may be on their own account, they have but little affinity with the strictly exegetical character of the present work. Monographs on chapters or sections are generally noticed by Meyer *in loc.* The reader will find a very valuable notice of the Patristic commentaries given by Dr. Lightfoot, 6th ed., p. 227 sqq.]

Akersloot (Theodorus), Reformed minister in Holland : de Sendbrief van Paullus an de Galaten, 4to, Leyd. 1695 ; translated into German by Brussken. 4^0, Bremen, 1699.
Aurivillius (Olaus) : Animadversiones exegeticae et dogmatico-practicae in Epistolam S. Pauli ad Galatas. 4^0, Halae, 1702.

Bagge (Henry T. J.) : St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, the text revised and illustrated by a commentary. 8^0, Lond. 1857.
Battus (Bartholomäus), Professor of Theology at Greifswald : Commentarii in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4^0, Gryphisw. 1613.
Baumgarten (Sigmund Jakob), Professor of Theology at Halle : Auslegung der Briefe Pauli an die Galater, Ephes., Philipp., Coloss., Philem., und Thessal. (Mit. Beyträgen von J. S. Semler). 4^0, Halle, 1767.
Betuleius (Matthäus) : Epistola Pauli ad Galatas, paraphrasi et controversiarum explicatione illustrata. 8^0, Halae Sax. 1617.
Borger (Elias Annes), Professor of Greek and History at Leyden : Interpretatio Epistolae Pauli ad Galatas. 8^0, Leyd. 1807.
Boston (Thomas), minister of Ettrick : A Paraphrase upon the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians [Works, vol. vi.]. 12^0, Lond. 1853.
Breithaupt (Joachim Justus), Professor of Theology at Halle : Observationum ex Commentario Lutheri in Epistolam ad Galatas exercitationes 10 ; in his "Miscellanea."
Brentz (Johann), Provost at Stuttgard : Explicatio Epistolae ad Galatas. 1558.
Brown (John), D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology to the United Presbyterian Church, Edinburgh : An Exposition of the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. 8^0, Edin. 1853.
Bugenhagen (Johann), Professor of Theology at Wittenberg : Adnotationes in Epistolas ad Gal., Eph., Philipp., Coloss., Thess., Timoth., Tit., Philem., et Hebraeos. 8^0, Basil. [1525] 1527.

Carey (Sir Stafford), M.A. : The Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Galatians, with a paraphrase and introduction. 12^0, Lond. 1867.
Carpzov (Johann Benedict), Professor of Theology and Greek at Helmstädt : Brief an die Galater übersetzt. 8^0, Helmstädt, 1794.

CHANDLER (Samuel), minister in London : A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians, . . . together with a critical and practical commentary on the two Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians. 4^0, Lond. 1777.

CHEMNITZ (Christian), Professor of Theology at Jena : Collegium theologicum super Epistolam ad Galatas. 4^0, Jenae, 1656.

CHYTRAEUS [or KOCHHAFE] (David), Professsor of Theology at Rostock : Enarratio in Epistolam ad Galatas. 8^0, Francof. 1569.

CLAUDIUS Taurinensis, Bishop of Turin, called also Altissiodorensis or Autissiodorensis : Commentarius in Epistolam ad Galatas [in Magn. Bibl. Vet. Patr. ix.].

COCCEJUS [or KOCH] (Johann), Professor of Theology at Leyden : Commentarius in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4^0, Lugd. Bat. 1665.

CRELL (Johann), Socinian teacher at Racow : Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas ex praelectionibus J. Crellii conscriptus a Jon. Schlichting. 8^0, Racov. 1628.

EADIE (John), D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis to United Presbyterian Church, Glasgow : A Commentary on the Greek text of the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. 8^0, Edin. 1869.

ELLICOTT (Charles John), D D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol : St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians ; with a critical and grammatical commentary, and a revised translation.
8vo, Lond. 1854. 4th edition corrected, 1867.

ESMARCH (Heinrich Peter Christian) : Brief an die Gälater übersetzt. 8^0, Flensb. 1784.

FERGUSON (James), minister of Kilwinning, Ayrshire : A brief Exposition of the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians. 8^0, Lond. 1659.

FLATT (Johann Friedrich von), Professor of Thelogy at Tübingen : Vorlesungen über den Brief an die Galater und Epheser, herausgegeben von Ch. F. Kling. 8^0, Tübing. 1828.

FRITZSCHE (Karl Friedrich August), Professor of Theology at Rostock : Commentarius de nonnullis Epistolae ad Galatas locis. 3 partes. 4^0, Rostoch. 1833–4 [and in Fritzschiorum Opuscula.]

GRYNAEUS (Johann Jakob), Professor of Theology at Heidelberg : Analysis Epistolae ad Galatas. 4^0, Basil. 1583.

GWYNNE (G. J.) : Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. 8^0, Dubl. 1863.

HALDANE (James Alexander), Edinburgh : An Exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians. 12^0, Lond. 1848.

HENSLER (Christian Gotthilf), Professor of Theology at Kiel : Der Brief an die Galater übersetzt mit Anmerkungen. 8^0, Leip. 1805.

HERMANN (Johann Gottfried Jakob), Professor of Poetry at Leipzig : De Pauli Epistolae ad Galatas tribus primis capitibus. 8^0, Lips. 1832.

HILGENFELD (Adolf), Professor of Theology at Jena : Der Galaterbrief übersetzt, in seinen geschichtlichen Beziehungen untersucht und erklärt. 8^0, Leip. 1852.

HOFMANN (Johann Christian Konrad von), Professor of Theology at Erlangen : Die Heilige Schrift neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht. II. 1. Der Brief Pauli an die Galater.
8^0, Nördlingen, 1863 ; 2te veränderte Auflage, 1872.

HOLSTEN (Carl), Teacher in Gymnasium at Rostock : Inhalt und Gedankengang des Briefes an die Galater, 4to, Rostock 1859 ; also, Zum Evangelium des Paulus und Petrus. 8^0, Rostock, 1868.

JATHO (Georg Friedrich), Director of Gymnasium at Hildesheim : Pauli Brief an die Galater nach seinem inneren Gedankengange erläutert. 8^0, Hildesheim 1856.

Krause (Friedrich August Wilhelm), Private tutor at Vienna : Der Brief an die Galater übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen begleitet. 8⁰, Frankf. 1788.

Kromayer (Hieronymus), Professor of Theology at Leipzig : Commentarius in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4⁰, Lips. 1670.

Kunad (Andreas), Professor of Theology at Wittenberg : Disputationes in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4⁰, Witteb. 1658.

Lightfoot (Joseph Barber), D.D., Professor of Divinity at Cambridge : St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. A revised text, with introduction, notes, and dissertations. 8⁰, Lond. 1865. 6th edition, 1880.

Locke (John), the philosopher : A Paraphrase and notes on the Epistles to Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians. 4⁰, Lond. 1733.

Lushington (Thomas), M.A., Rector of Burnham-Westgate, Norfolk : A Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians [said to be chiefly translated from Crell]. fol., Lond. 1650.

Luther (Martin) : In Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas Commentarius (brevior), 4to, Lips. 1519 ; ab auctore recognitus, 1523. In Epist. P. ad Gal. Commentarius (major) ex praelectionibus D. M. Lutheri collectus . . . a Luthero recognitus et castigatus, 8vo, Viteb. 1535 ; jam denuo diligenter recognitus, 8vo, Viteb. 1538. Often reprinted ; translated into English in 1575, and often re-issued.

Lyser [or **Leyser**] (Polycarp), Professor of Theology at Wittenberg : Analysis Epistolae ad Galatas. 4⁰, Witteb. 1586.

Matthias (G. W.), Co rector of Gymnasium at Cassel : Der Galaterbrief griechisch und deutsch, nebst einer Erklärung seiner schwierigen Stellen. 8⁰, Cassel, 1865.

Matthies (Konrad Stephan), Professor of Theology at Greifswald : Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Galater. 8⁰, Greifswald, 1833.

Mayer (Ferdinand Gregorius), Professor of Greek at Vienna : Der Brief Pauli an die Galater und der 2 Brief an die Thessalonicher übersetzt mit Anmerkungen. 8⁰, Wien, 1788.

Michaelis (Johann David), Professor of Philosophy at Göttingen : Paraphrase und Anmerkungen über die Briefe Pauli an die Galater, Ephes., Phil., Col., Thessal., Tim., Tit., Philem. 4⁰, Bremen und Götting. 1750 ; 2te vermehrte Auflage, 1769.

Moldenhawer (Johann Heinrich Daniel), pastor at Hamburg : Brief an die Galater übersetzt. 8⁰, Hamb. 1773.

Morus (Samuel Friedrich Nathanael), Professor of Theology at Leipzig : Acroases in Epistolas Paulinas ad Galatas et Ephesios. 8⁰, Leip. 1795.

Musculus [or **Meusslin**] (Wolfgang), Professor of Theology at Berne : In Epistolas Apostoli Pauli ad Galatas et Ephesios commentarii. fol., Basil, (1561) 1569.

Pareus [or **Waengler**] (David), Professor of Theology at Heidelberg : In divinam S. Pauli ad Galatas Epistolam commentarius. 4o, Heidelb. 1613.

Paulus (Heinrich Eberhard Georg), Professor of Theology at Heidelberg : Des Apostel Paulus Lehrbriefe an die Galater und Römerchristen, wortgetreu übersetzt mit erläuternden Zwischensätzen, einem Uberblick des Lehrinhalts und Bemerkungen über schwere Stellen. 8⁰, Heidelb. 1831.

Perkins (William), minister at Cambridge : A commentarie or exposition upon the five first chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians . . . Continued with a supplement upon the sixt chapter by Rodolfe Cudworth, B. D. [Works, vol. ii.]. 2⁰, Lond. 1609.

Prime (John), Fellow of New College, Oxford : Exposition and observations upon St. Paul to the Galatians. 8⁰, Oxf. 1587.

Reithmayr (Franz Xaver), R. C. Professor of Theology at Munich : Commentar zum Briefe an die Galater. 8⁰, München, 1865.

Riccaltoun (Robert), minister at Hobkirk: Notes and Observations on the Epistle to the Galatians [Works, iii.]. 8^0, Edin. 1771.

Rollock (Robert), Principal of University of Edinburgh: Analysis logica in Epistolam ad Galatas. 8^0, Lond. 1602.

Rückert (Leopold Immanuel), Professor of Theology at Jena: Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Galater. 8^0, Leip. 1833.

Sanday (W.), Principal of Hatfield Hall, Durham. The Epistle to the Galatians with a Commentary. (Handy Commentary Series, edited by C. J. Ellicott, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol). 16mo. London, Paris, and New York.

Sardinoux (Pierre-Auguste): Commentaire sur l'épitre aux Galates, précédé d'une introduction critique. 8^0, Valence, 1837.

Schaff (Philip), D.D., Professor of Theology at New York: An Introduction and comment on chapters i. ii. of the Epistle to the Galatians [in the Mercersburg Review, Jan. 1861].

Schilling (Johann Georg): Versuch einer Uebersetzung des Briefes an die Galater, mit erklärenden Bemerkungen, nach Koppe. 8^0, Leip. 1792.

Schlichting (Jonas), Socinian minister at Racow. See Crell (Johann).

Schmid (Sebastian), Professor of Theology at Strassburg: Commentarius in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4^0, Kiloni, 1690.

Schmoller (Otto) of Urach, Würtemberg: Der Brief Pauli an die Galater theologisch-homiletisch bearbeitet [in Lange's Bibelwerk], 8vo, Bielefeld 1862; 2te Auflage 1865. [Translated by C. C. Starbuck, A.M.; edited, with additions, by M. B. Riddle, D.D. 8^0, New York and Edin. 1870.]

Schott (Heinrich August), Professor of Theology at Jena: Epistolae Pauli ad Thessalonicenses et Galatas. Textum Graecum recognovit et commentario perpetuo illustravit H. A. Schott. 8^0, Leips. 1834.

Schütze (Theodor Johann Abraham): Scholia in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4^0, Gerae, 1784.

Semler (Johann Salomon), Professor of Theology at Halle: Paraphrasis Epistolae Pauli ad Galatas. 8^0, Halae, 1779.

Seripando (Girolamo), Cardinal: Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas; ad nonnullas quaestiones ex textu Epistolae catholicae responsiones. 8^0, Antv. 1565.

Stolberg (Balthasar), Professor of Greek at Wittenberg: Lectiones publicae in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4^0, Wittemb. 1667.

Struensee (Adam), pastor at Altona): Erklärung des Briefes an die Galater. 4^0, Flensburg, 1764.

Trana (August Leopold): Pauli ad Galatas Epistola. Exposuit, etc. 8^0, Gothob. 1857.

Turner (Samuel Hulbeart), D.D., Professor of Biblical Interpretation at New York: The Epistle to the Galatians in Greek and English, with an analysis and exegetical commentary. 8^0, New York, 1856.

Usteri (Leonhard), Professor of Theology at Berne: Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Galater, nebst einer Beilage [illegible] und einigen Excursen. 8^0, Zürich, 1833.

Victorinus (C. Marius), teacher of rhetoric at Rome about A.D. 360: In Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas commentariorum libri duo [in Mai's *Scrip. Vet. Nov. Coll.* iii. 2].

Weber (Michael), Professor of Theology at Halle: Der Brief an die Galater uebersetzt, mit Anmerkungen. 8^0, Leip. 1778.

Weise (Friedrich), Professor of Theology at Helmstädt: Commentarius in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4^0, Helmst. 1705.

Wesselius (Johannes), Professor of Theology at Leyden: Commentarius analytico-exegeticus tam litteralis quam realis in Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas. 4^0, Lugd. Bat. 1750.

WIESELER (Karl), Professor of Theology at Göttingen: Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Galater, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Lehre und Geschichte des Apostels. 8⁰, Götting. 1859.

WINDISCHMANN (Friedrich), R.C. Professor of Theology at Munich: Erklärung des Briefes an die Galater. 8⁰, Mainz, 1843.

WINER (Georg Benedict), Professor of Theology at Leipzig: Pauli ad Galatas Epistola. Latine vertit et perpetua annotatione illustravit Dr. G. B. Winer. 8⁰, Lips. 1821. Editio quarta aucta et emendata, 1859.

ZACHARIAE (Gotthilf Traugott), Professor of Theology at Kiel: Paraphrastische Erklärung der Briefe Pauli an die Galater, Ephes., Phil., Col., und Thess. 8⁰, Götting. [1771] 1787.

PREFACE.

SINCE the days of Luther, who, as is well known, bestowed more especial and repeated labor on the exposition of this than of any other book of the New Testament, the Epistle to the Galatians has always been held in high esteem as the Gospel's banner of freedom. To it, and to the kindred Epistle to the Romans, we owe most directly the springing up and development of the ideas and energies of the Reformation, which have overcome the work-righteousness of Romanism with all the superstition and unbelief accompanying it, and which will in the future, by virtue of their divine life once set free, overcome all fresh resistance till they achieve complete victory. This may be affirmed even of our present position towards Rome. For, if Paul by this Epistle introduces us into the very arena of his victory ; if he makes us witnesses of his not yielding, even for an hour, to the false brethren ; if he bids us hear how he confronts even his gravely erring fellow-apostle with the unbending standard of divinely-revealed truth ; if he breaks all the spell of hypocrisy and error by which the foolish Galatians were bound, and in the clear power of the Holy Spirit brilliantly vindicates what no angel from heaven could with impunity have assailed ; how should that doctrine, which at this moment the sorely beset old man in the chair of the fallible Peter proposes to invest with the halo of divine sanction,—how should the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον from Rome, which it is now sought to push to the extremity of the most flagrant *contradictio in adjecto*—possibly issue in any other final result than an accelerated process of self-dissolution ? It is, in fact, the profoundly sad destiny which a blinded and obdurate hierarchy must, doubtless amidst unspeakable moral harm, fulfil, that it should be always digging further and further at its own grave, till at length—and now the goal seems approaching, when these dead are to bury their dead—with the last stroke of the spade it shall sink into that grave, to rise no more.

The Epistle to the Galatians carries us back to that first Council of the Church, which at its parting could present to the world the simple and true self-witness : ἔδοξε τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι καὶ ἡμῖν. How deep a shadow of contrast this throws not merely on the Vatican Fathers, but also—we cannot conceal it—on our own Synods, when their proceedings are pervaded by a zeal which, carried away by carnal aims, forfeits the simplicity, clearness, and wisdom of the Holy Spirit! Under such circumstances the Spirit is silent, and no longer bears His witness to the conscience; and instead of the blessing of synodal church-life,—so much hoped for, and so much subjected to question,—we meet with decrees, which are mere compromises of human minds very much opposed to each other,—agreements, over which such a giving the right hand of holy fellowship as we read of in this letter (ii. 9) would be a thing impossible.

In issuing for the fifth time (the fourth edition having appeared in 1862) my exposition of this Epistle, so transcendently important alike in its doctrinal and historical bearings, I need hardly say that I have diligently endeavored to do my duty regarding it. I have sought to improve it throughout, and to render it more complete, in accordance with its design; and, while doing so, I have striven after a clearness and definiteness of expression, which should have nothing in common with the miserable twilight-haze and intentional concealment of meaning that characterize the selection of theological language in the present day. If I have been pretty often under the necessity of opposing the more recent expositors of the Epistle or of its individual sections, I need hardly give an assurance that I, on my part, am open to, and grateful for, any contradiction, provided only some true light is elicited thereby. Even if that opposition should come from the energies of youth, which cannot yet have attained their full exegetical maturity, I gladly adopt the language of the tragedian (Aeschyl. *Agam.* 583 f.):

Νικώμενος λόγοισιν οὐκ ἀναίνομαι·
'Αεὶ γὰρ ἥβᾳ τοῖς γέρουσιν εὖ μαθεῖν.

DR. MEYER.

HANNOVER, 18*th June*, 1870.

THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

SEC. I.—THE GALATIANS.

THE region of *Galatia*, or *Gallograecia*,[1] bounded by Paphlagonia, Pontus, Cappadocia, and Bithynia, and having as its chief cities Ancyra, Pessinus, and Tavium, derived its name from the *Gauls.*[2] For the *Gallic* tribes of the Τροκμοί and Τολιστοβόγοι[3]—in conjunction with the Germanic[4] tribe of the Tectosages, which, according to Strabo, was akin to them in language[5]—after invading and devastating Macedonia and Greece (Justin. xxiv. 4) about 280 B.C., and establishing in Thrace the kingdom of Tyle,[6] migrated thence under the leadership of Leonorius and Lotharius to Asia, where they received a territory from the Bithynian king Nicomedes for their services in war. This territory they soon enlarged by predatory expeditions;[7] although by Attalus, king of Pergamus, who conquered them, it was restricted to the fertile region of the Halys.[8] This powerful, dreaded,[9] and freedom-loving[10] people were brought into subjection to the Romans by the consul Cn. Manlius Vulso, 189 B.C.;[11] but they still for a long time retained both their Celtic cantonal constitution and their own tetrarchs,[12] who subsequently bore the title of king.[1] The last of these kings, Amyntas (put to death 26 B.C.), owed it to the favor of Antonius and Augustus that Pisidia and parts of Lycaonia[2] and of Pamphylia were added to his territory.[3] In the year 26 Galatia, as enlarged under Amyntas, became a Roman province.[4]

---

[1] See generally Strabo, xii. 5.

[2] Γαλάται, which is only a later form of the original Κελτοί or Κέλται, Pausan. i. 3, 5.

[3] Strabo, *l.c.* p. 566.

[4] This serves to explain Jerome's statement, based on personal experience (*Prol. in libr. secund. comment. in ep. ad Gal.*), that the popular language, which in his time was still spoken by the Galatians along with Greek, was almost the same (*eandem paene*) with that of the *Treviri.* Now the Treviri were Germans (Strabo, iv. p. 194), and "circa affectationem Germanicae originis ultro ambitiosi," "in the endeavor to pass for Germans, very ambitious" (Tacit. *Germ.* 28). Comp. Jablonski, *de lingua Lycaon.* p. 23. See, generally, Diefenbach, *Celtica*, Stuttg. 1839 f.; Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschl.* i. p. 19 ff. The two last, without adequate grounds, call in question the Germanic nationality of the Galatians. See, on the other side, Wieseler, p. 524 ff., and in Herzog's *Encykl.* XIX. p. 524. The conversion of the Galatians is the beginning of *German* Church-history.

[5] Caes. *B. Gall.* vi. 24; Memnon in Phot. cod. 224, p. 374.

[6] Polyb. iv. 45 f.

[7] Liv. xxxviii. 16; Flor. ii. 11; Justin. xxv. 2; Strabo, iv. p. 187, xii. p. 566.

[8] Strabo, xii. p. 567; Liv. xxxviii. 16.

[9] Polyb. v. 53; 2 Macc. viii. 20.

[10] Flor. ii. 11.

[11] Liv. xxxviii. 12 ff.

[12] Strabo, xii. pp. 541, 567.

On account of the additional territories thus annexed to Galatia proper under Amyntas, it has been maintained that the readers of this epistle are not to be looked upon as the Galatians proper, but as the *new Galatians*, that is, *Lycaonians* (especially the Christians of *Derbe* and *Lystra*) and *Pisidians*.[5] But this view is decisively opposed both by the language of Acts (xiv. 6, comp. with xvi. 6, xviii. 23), in which the universally current popular mode of designation, not based on the new provincial arrangements, is employed ; and also by the circumstance that Paul could not have expressed himself (Gal. i. 2) in a more singular and indefinite way than by ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας, if he had *not* meant Galatia proper, the old Galatia. Nor are any passages found in Greek authors, in which districts of Lycaonia or Pisidia are designated, in accordance with that extension of the limits of the province, by the name of Galatia.[6]

The founder of the Galatian churches was Paul himself (Gal. i. 6–8, iv. 13 ff.) on his second missionary journey, Acts xvi. 6 (not so early as xiv. 6). Bodily weakness (iv. 13) had compelled him to make a halt in Galatia, and during his stay he planted Christianity there. Looking at the involuntary character of this occasion and the unknown nature of the locality to which his first work in the country was thus, as it were, accidentally directed, it might appear doubtful whether in this case he followed his usual rule, as attested in Acts, of commencing his work of conversion with the Jews ; but we must assume that he did so,[7] for the simple reason that he would be sure to seek the shelter and nursing, which in sickness he needed, in the house of one of his own nation : comp. on iv. 14. Nor was there any want of Jewish residents, possibly in considerable numbers, in Galatia (as we may with reason infer from Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 3. 4, xvi. 6. 2, as well as from the diffusion of the Jews over Asia generally ; not, however, from 1 Pet. i. 1) ; although from the epistle itself it is evident[8] that the larger part, indeed the great majority, of its readers[1] consisted of *Gentile Christians.* The arguments from the Old Testament (together with a partially rabbinical mode of interpretation), which Paul nevertheless employs, were partly based on the necessary course of the apostolic preaching which had to announce Christ as the fulfilment of Old Testament promises, as well as on the acquaintance with the Old Testament which was to be presupposed in all Christian churches;[2] partly suggested to the apostle by the special subject itself which was in question;[3] partly justified, and indeed rendered necessary, by the fact that the apostle—who must, at any rate, have taken notice of the antagonistic *teachers* and the means of warding off their attack—had to do with churches which had already for a time been worked upon by Judaists and had thus been sufficiently introduced to a knowledge of the Old Testament. The supposition of Storr, Mynster,[4] and Credner, that great part of the Galatian Christians had been previously proselytes of the gate, appears thus to be unnecessary, and is destitute of proof from the epistle itself, and indeed opposed to its expressions; see on iv. 9.

---

[1] Cic. *p. rege Deiotaro;* Vellei. ii. 84 ; Appian, v. p. 1135 ; Plut. *Ant.* 61.

[2] Not the whole of Lycaonia, particularly not the south-eastern portion and Iconium. See Rückert, *Magaz.* I. p. 98 ff.

[3] Dio Cass. xlix. 32, liii. 26 ; Strabo, xii. p. 569.

[4] Dio Cass. liii. 26 ; Strabo, xii. p. 569. See generally, in addition to the Commentaries and Introductions, Wernsdorf, *de republ. Galatar.*, Norimb. 1743 ; Hoffmann, *Introd. theol. crit. in lect. ep. P. ad Gal. et Col.*, Lips. 1750 ; Schulze, *de Galatis*, Francof. 1756 ; Mynster, *Einl. in d. Brief an d. Gal.*, in his *kl. theol. Schr.*, Kopenh. 1825, p. 49 ff. ; Hermes, *rerum Galaticar. specimen*, Vratisl. 1822 ; Baumstark, in Pauly's *Realencykl.* III. 604 ff. ; Rüetschi, in Herzog's *Encykl.* IV. p. 637 f. ; Contzen, *Wanderungen der Celten*, Leip. 1861.

[5] Joh. Joach. Schmidt (in Michaelis) ; Mynster, *l.c.* p. 58 ff. ; Niemeyer, *de temp. quo ep. ad Gal. etc.*, Gött. 1827 ; Paulus, in the *Heidelb. Jahrb.* 1827, p. 636 ff., and *Lehrbriefe an d. Gal. u. Röm.* p. 25 ff. ; Ulrich, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, ii. ; Böttger, *Beitr.* 1 and 3 ; Thiersch, *Kirche im apost. Zeitalt.* p. 124.

[6] See Rückert, *Magaz.* I. p. 105 f. ; Anger, *de ratione temp.* p. 132 ff. ; Wieseler, *Chronol. d. apost. Zeitalt.* p. 281 f., and on *Gal.* p. 530 ff.

[7] As also Neander, de Wette, Wieseler, and most others assume, in opposition, however, to Schneckenburger (*Zweck d. Apostelgesch.* p. 104), Baur and Hilgenfeld.

[8] See sec. 2.

SEC. II.—OCCASION, OBJECT, AND CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

Judaizing Christian teachers with Pharisaic leanings (comp. Acts xvi. 1)—emissaries from Palestine (not unbelieving Jews; Michaelis, *Einl.*)—had made their appearance among the Galatian churches after Paul, and with their attacks upon his apostolic dignity (i. 1, 11, ii. 14), and their assertion of the necessity of circumcision for Christians (v. 2, 11, 12, vi. 12 f.), which involved as a necessary consequence the obligation of the whole law (v. 3), had found but too ready a hearing, so that the Judaizing tendency was on the point of getting the upper hand (i. 6, iii. 1, 3, iv. 9 ff., 21, v. 2 ff., 7). Now the question is, whether these anti-Pauline teachers—who, however, are not, on account of v. 12, vi. 13, to be considered either wholly or in part as proselytes[5]—made their appearance *before,*[6] or not till *after,*[7] the second visit of the apostle (Acts xviii. 23; see sec. 3). From i. 6, iii. 1, it is evident that Paul now for the first time has to do with the church as actually *perverted;* he is surprised and warmly indignant at what had taken place. Nevertheless it is evident, from i. 9, v. 3, iv. 16, that he had already spoken personally in Galatia against Judaizing perversion, and that with great earnestness. We must therefore assume that, when Paul was among the Galatians for the second time, the danger was only *threatening,* but there already existed an *inclination* to yield to it, and his language against it was consequently of a *warning* and *precautionary* nature. It was only after the apostle's departure that the false teachers *set to work* with their perversions; and although they did not get so far as circumcision (see on iv. 10), still they met with so much success,[1] and caused so much disturbance of peace (v. 15), that the accounts came upon him with all the surprise which he indicates in i. 6, iii. 1.[2]

---

[1] Not the whole, as Hilgenfeld thinks; comp. Hofmann.

[2] Comp. on iv. 21.

[3] See sec. 2.

[4] *L.c.* p. 76.

[5] Neander, Schott, de Wette; see, on the other hand, Hilgenfeld, p. 46 f.

[6] Credner, Rückert, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Reuss, Wieseler, and others.

[7] Neander, de Wette, Hofmann, and others.

In accordance with this state of things which gave occasion to the letter, it was the *object* of Paul to defend in it his apostolic authority, and to bring his readers to a triumphant conviction of the freedom of the Christian from circumcision and the Mosaic law through the justification arising from God's grace in Christ. But we are not entitled to assume that "in the liveliness of his zeal he represented the matter as too dangerous;"[3] the more especially as it involved the most vital question of Pauline Christianity, and along with it also the whole personal function and position of the apostle, who was divinely conscious of the truth of his gospel, and therefore must not be judged, in relation to his opponents, according to the usual standard of "party against party."[4]

As regards *contents*, (1) the apologetico-dogmatic portion of the epistle divides itself into two branches : (*a*) the defence of the apostolic standing and dignity of Paul, ch. i. and ii., in connection with which the foundation of Christian freedom is also set forth in ii. 15–21 ; (*b*) the proof that the Christian, through God's grace in Christ, is independent of circumcision and Mosaism, ch iii. and iv. Next, (2) in the hortatory portion, the readers are encouraged to hold fast to their Christian freedom, but also not to misuse it, ch. v. Then follow other general exhortations, ch. vi. 1–10 ; and finally an energetic autograph warning against the seducers (vi. 11–16), and the conclusion. The idea that the epistle is the *reply* to a *letter* of information and inquiry *from the church*,[5] is neither based on any direct evidence in the epistle itself (how wholly different is the case with 1 Cor. !) nor indirectly suggested by particular passages (not even by iv. 12); and such an assumption is by no means necessary for understanding the course and arguments of the epistle.

SEC. III. –TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION—GENUINENESS.

The date of composition may be gathered from iv. 13, compared with Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23. From εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν τὸ πρότερον, iv. 13, it is most distinctly evident that, when Paul wrote, he had already twice visited Galatia and had preached the gospel there. The constant use of εὐαγγελίζεσθαι to denote *oral* preaching precludes us from taking[6] τὸ πρότερον as said with relation to his present *written* instruction. Those, therefore, are certainly in error who assume that the epistle was composed after the *first* visit of the apostle, whether this first visit be placed correctly at Acts xvi. 6[7] or erroneously at Acts xiv. 6.[1] As regards the latter, Keil has indeed asserted that in ch. i. and ii. Paul continues his history only down to his second journey to Jerusalem, Acts xi. 30 ; that he does not mention the apostolic conference and decree, Acts xv. ;[2] and that in this epistle his judgment of Mosaism is more severe than after that conference. But the journey, ii. 1, is identical with that of Acts xv. (see the commentary) ; his omission to mention the apostolic conference and decree[3] is necessarily connected with the self-subsistent position—wholly independent of the authority of all the other apostles, and indeed recognized by the "pillars" themselves (ii. 9 f.)—which Paul claimed for himself on principle in opposition to Judaizing efforts. Therefore neither in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (viii. 1 ff., x. 23 ff.), nor in that to the Romans (ch. xiv.), nor anywhere else, does he take any notice of the Jerusalem decree.[4] Assured of his own apostolic independence as a minister of Christ directly called and furnished with the revelation of the gospel for the Gentile world in particular, he has never, in any point of doctrine, cited in his favor the authority of other apostles or decrees of the church ; and he was least likely to do so when, as in the present case, the matter at stake was a question not merely affecting some point of church-order, but concerning the deepest principles of the plan of salvation.[5] Moreover, the first three injunctions of that decree in particular (Acts xv. 29) agree so little with the principle of full Christian liberty, consistently upheld in the letters of the apostle, that we must suppose the decree to have speedily—with his further official experience acquired after the council—lost altogether for him its provisional obligation. It is, further, a mistake to apply *ἡ περίχωρος*, Acts xiv. 6, to Galatia, as, besides Keil, also Koppe, Borger, Niemeyer, Mynster, Paulus, Böttger, and others, have done ; for this *περίχωρος* can only be the country round Lystra and Derbe, and it is quite inadmissible to transfer the name to the Lycaonian region (see sec. 1). Lastly, in order to prove a very early composition of the letter, soon after the conversion of the readers, appeal has been made to *οὕτω ταχέως*, i. 6, but without due exegetical grounds (see the commentary) ; and indeed the mention of Barnabas in ii. 13 ought not to have been adduced,[6] for a *personal* acquaintance of the readers with him (which they must certainly have made before Acts xv. 39) is not at all expressed in it. If, in accordance with all these considerations, the epistle was *not* written after the first visit to Galatia,—a date also inconsistent with the fact that its contents presuppose a church-life already developed, and an influence of the false teachers which had already been some time at work—and if the first visit of the apostle is to be placed, not at Acts xiv. 6, but at Acts xvi. 6,[1] followed by the second visit *confirming* the churches, Acts xviii. 23, then most modern expositors, following the earlier, are right in their conclusion that *the epistle was not composed until after* Acts xviii. 23.[2] We must reject the views, which place the date of composition *between Acts* xvi. 6 and *Acts* xviii. 23, as maintained by Grotius (on i. 2), Baumgarten, Semler,[3] Michaelis, Koppe, Storr, Borger, Schmidt, Mynster, or which carry the epistle back to a date even *before the apostolic conference*, as held by Beza, Calvin, Keil, Niemeyer, Paulus,[4] Böttger,[5] Ulrich.

---

[1] To the extent, at any rate, of an observance of the Jewish feast-days and seasons (iv. 10).

[2] Comp. also Ewald, p. 54 ; Lechler, *apost. Zeitalt.* p. 383.

[3] De Wette.

[4] Baur, *Paulus*, I. p. 282, ed. 2.

[5] Hofmann.

[6] With Grotius, and Keil, *Anal.* IV. 2, p. 70.

[7] Michaelis.

---

[1] Keil.

[2] Comp. also Ulrich, *l.c.*

[3] Against the opinion that the unhistorical character of the narrative of the apostolic council and decree may be inferred from our epistle (Baur, Schwegler, Zeller, Hilgenfeld), see on Acts xv. 15 f. The Tübingen school believe that in this epistle they have found "the Archimedean point of their task" (Hilgenfeld, in the *Zeitschrift f. histor. Theol.* 1855, p. 484).

[4] This *uniform* silence as to the decree in *all* the epistles shows that that silence in *our* epistle must not be explained either by the presumed *acquaintance* of the Galatians with it (Schaff, p. 182), or by the idea that the apostle was unwilling to supply his opponents with any *weapon* against him (Ebrard).

[5] "His word as Christ's apostle for the Gentiles must be decree enough for them" (Thiersch, *Kirche im apost. Zeitalt.* p. 130. See also Wieseler, in Herzog's *Encykl.* XIX. p. 528).

[6] Koppe.

As we cannot gather from the relative expression οὕτω ταχέως (i. 6) *how soon* after Acts xviii. 23 the epistle was composed, the *year* of its composition cannot be stated more precisely than (see Introd. to Acts) as about 56 or 57.[6] *Ephesus* appears to be the *place* from which it was written ; for Paul proceeded thither after his second labors in Galatia (Acts xix. 1). So Theophylact, Oecumenius, Erasmus, and most modern expositors. Rückert, however, following Hug, maintains that Paul wrote his epistle *very soon* after his departure from Galatia, probably even on the *journey* to Ephesus ; but, on the other hand, the passage iv. 18 indicates that after the apostle's departure the Judaists had perverted the churches which he had warned and confirmed, and some measure of time must have been required for this, although the perversion appears still so recent that there is no adequate reason for postponing the composition of the epistle to the sojourn of the apostle at Corinth, Acts xx. 3.[7]

The usual subscription, which is given by the old codd. B**, K, L, says

---

[1] It has been objected, indeed, that on this journey Paul only *confirmed* the churches, which presupposes an earlier conversion (Acts xv. 36 ff., xvi. 5). But Acts xvi. 6 begins a new stage in the historical narrative, and Phrygia and Galatia are *separated* from those places to which the *confirming* ministry referred. Nor is it to be said that in Acts xvi. 6 Paul was withheld by the Spirit from preaching in Galatia. For the hindrance by the Spirit affected not Galatia, but the regions along the coast of Asia Minor. See on Acts xvi. 6.

[2] So Bertholdt, Eichhorn, Hug, de Wette, Winer, Hemsen, Neander, Usteri, Schott, Rückert, Anger, Credner, Guericke, Olshausen, Wieseler, Reuss, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Bleek, Hofmann, and others.

[3] On *Baumg.* p. 895, not in the *Paraphr.*

[4] According to Paulus, the apostle wrote to the *New-Galatians* (see sec. 1), whom he converted at Acts xiv. 6 and visited for the second time (Gal. xiv. 13) at Acts xiv. 21.

[5] According to Böttger (*Beitr.* 3, § 1–11), the epistle is addressed to the *New-Galatians* (Lycaonians and Pisidians), and was written in the year 51, after the first missionary journey of the apostle. Böttger has repeated Keil's arguments, and has added fresh ones, which are untenable. See their copious refutation by Rückert, *Magaz.* I. p. 112 ff.

[6] From the remarkable difference in the positions which have been assigned to our letter in the history of the apostle—Marcion (in Tertull. *c. Marc.* 5, and in Epiph. *Haer.* xlii. 9), and subsequently Michaelis, Baumgarten, Koppe, Schmidt, Keil, Mynster, Niemeyer, Paulus, Ulrich, making it the very *first*, and Schrader and Köhler, the very *last* of the Pauline epistles,—it was natural that the year of composition should be fixed at the most various dates, even apart from the differences of reckoning as to the Pauline chronology. In consequence of this divergence of opinion as to its historical position, the *statements as to the place of composition* have necessarily been very various (Troas, Corinth, Antioch, Ephesus, Rome).

[7] Bleek conjecturally.

ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης; and Jerome, Theodoret, Euthalius, and the Syrian church, as afterwards Baronius, Flacius, Salmasius, Estius, Calovius, and others, held this opinion, which arose simply from a misunderstanding of iv. 20, vi. 11, and especially vi. 17, and was quite unwarrantably supported by ii. 10 (comp. with Rom. xv. 28). Nevertheless, recently Schrader[1] and Köhler,[2] the latter of whom exceeds the former in caprice, again date the epistle from Rome.[3]

The *genuineness* is established by external testimony[4] — although the apostolic Fathers contain no trace in any measure certain, and Justin's writings only a probable trace, of the letter[5] — as well as by the completely and vividly Pauline cast of the writer's spirit and language. It is thus so firmly established, that, except by Bruno Bauer's wanton "*Kritik*" (1850), it has never been, and never can be, doubted. The numerous *interpolations* which, according to Weisse,[6] the apostolic text has undergone, depend entirely on a subjective criticism of the style, conducted with an utter disregard of external critical testimony.

---

[1] i. p. 216 ff.

[2] *Abfassungzeit der epistol. Schriften*, p. 125 ff.

[3] For the refutation of which their arguments are not worthy, see Schott, *Erörterung*, pp. 63 ff., 41 ff., 116 ff.; Usteri, p. 222 ff.

[4] Iren. *Haer.* iii. 6. 5, iii. 7. 2, iii. 16. 3, v. 21. 1; Tatian, in Jerome; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. p. 468, ed. Sylb.; Tertull. *de praescr.* 6, *et al.*; *Canon Murat.*, Valentinus in Irenaeus, Marcion.

[5] Even in Polycarp, *Phil.* 5, comp. Gal. vi. 7, there may be a quite accidental similarity of expression. Lardner appealed to Clem. *ad Cor.* i. 49; Ignat. *ad Philad.* 1, *ad Magnes.* 8; Just. Mart. *ad Graec.* p. 40, ed. Colon, and discovered in these passages allusions to Gal. i. 4, i. 1, v. 4, iv. 12. There appears to be an actual allusion to this last passage in Justin, where it runs: γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ· ὅτι κἀγὼ ἤμην ὡς ὑμεῖς, "Become as I, because I was as you." The probability of this is increased by the fact that Justin soon afterwards uses the words, ἔχθραι, ἔρεις, ζῆλος, ἐριθεῖαι, θυμοί, καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις, which look like an echo of Gal. v. 20 f.

[6] *Beiträge zur Krit. d. Paulin. Briefe*, edited by Sulze, 1867, p. 19 ff.

Παύλου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Γαλάτας.

A B K ℵ, and many min., also Copt., give simply πρὸς Γαλάτας, which—doubtless the earliest superscription—is adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.

CHAPTER I.

Ver. 3. ἡμῶν] is wanting only in min., Damasc. Aug. (once); while A, min., Copt. Arm. Vulg. ms. Chrys. Ambrosiast. Pel. Ambr. (once), Fulg. place it after πατρός. But as in the other epistolary salutations there is no ἡμῶν after κυρίου, it was sometimes omitted, sometimes moved to the position, which it holds in the other epistles, after πατρός (Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2, *et al.*). — Ver. 4. περί] Elz. has [with B, ℵ***] ὑπέρ, in opposition to A D E F G K L ℵ, and many min., also Or. Theophyl. Oec. This external evidence is decisive, although Paul has written ὑπὲρ τ. ἁμαρτ. in 1 Cor. xv. 3. — Ver. 6. Χριστοῦ] is wanting in F G, Boern. Tert. (twice), Cypr. (twice), Lucif. Victorin. But according to the erroneous (although very ancient) connection of Χριστοῦ with καλέσαντος, Χριστοῦ, since the καλεῖν is *God's*, could not but give offence; and hence in 7, 43, 52, Theodoret, Or., it is changed for Θεοῦ. — Ver. 10. εἰ ἔτι] Elz. Scholz have εἰ γὰρ ἔτι. But γάρ is wanting in A B D* F G* ℵ, min., Copt. Arm. Vulg. It. Cyr. Damasc. and Latin Fathers, and has been inserted for the sake of connection. — Ver. 11. Instead of δέ, B D* F G ℵ**, 17, 213, It. Vulg. and Fathers have γάρ. The latter has mechanically entered from the use of the same word before and after (vv. 10, 12). ℵ*** has restored δέ. — Ver. 12. Instead of οὔτε, A D* F G ℵ, min, and Greek Fathers have οὐδέ. So Lachm. A mechanical error of copying after the previous οὐδέ. — Ver. 15. ὁ Θεός] after εὐδοκ. is wanting in B F G, 20, and many vss. and Fathers. Bracketed by Lachm. and Schott; deleted by Tisch.; rejected justly also by Ewald and Wieseler. An explanatory addition. — Ver. 17. ἀνῆλθον] B D E F G, 46, 74, Syr. p. (in the margin), Bas., have ἀπῆλθον. So Lachm. and Schott, while Elz. Tisch., following A K L ℵ Chrys. Vulg. Clar. have ἀνῆλθον. Certainly ἀνῆλθον has the appearance of interpolation, suggested as well by the direction of the journey (comp. ἀναβαίνειν εἰς Ἱεροσολ.) as by ver. 18. — Ver. 18. Instead of Πέτρον, supported by Elz., following D F K L ℵ*] A B ℵ, min., Syr. Erp. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Syr. p. (in the margin) have Κηφᾶν. Approved of by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Scholz, Schott, Tisch. The Hebrew name, both here and also in ii. 9, 11, 14, was supplanted by the Greek as a gloss; hence in ii. 7, 8, where Paul himself wrote the *Greek* name, the variation Κηφᾶς does not occur. We must not assume that the reading Κηφᾶν arose through several Fathers, like Clem. Al. in Eus. i. 12, being unwilling to refer the unfavorable account in ii. 11 ff. to the *Apostle* Peter (Winer), because otherwise the Hebrew name would only have been used from ii. 11 onwards.

Contents.—After the apostolic address and salutation (vv. 1–5), Paul immediately expresses his astonishment that his readers are so soon falling away to a false gospel ; against the preachers of which he utters his anathema, for he seeks to please God, and not men (vv. 6–10). Next, he assures them that his gospel is not of men, for he had not received it from any man, but Christ had revealed it to him (vv. 11, 12). In order to confirm this historically, he appeals to his pre-Christian activity in persecution and to his Jewish zeal at that time (vv. 13, 14), and gives an exact account of his journeys and abodes from his conversion down to his formal acknowledgment on the part of the original apostles ; from which it must be evident that he could be no disciple of the apostles (vv. 15–24).

Ver. 1. *Ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθοώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλά κ.τ.λ.*] Thus does Paul, with deliberate incisiveness and careful definition, bring into prominence at the very head of his epistle his (in the strictest sense) apostolic dignity, because doubt had been thrown on it by his opponents in Galatia. For by *οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων* he denies that his apostleship *proceeded* from men (*causa remotior*, "the more remote cause"), and by *οὐδὲ δι' ἄνθρ.* that it *came by means of* a man (*causa medians*, "the mediate cause"). [See Note I., p. 37.] It was neither of human *origin*, nor was a man the means of conveying it.[1] On *ἀπό*, comp. also Rom. xiii. 1. To disregard the diversity of meaning in the two prepositions,[2] although even Usteri is inclined to this view ("Paul meant to say that *in no respect* did his office depend on human authority"), is all the more arbitrary, seeing that, while the two negatives very definitely separate the two relations, these two relations cannot be expressed by the mere change of number.[3] This in itself would be but a feeble amplification of the thought, and in order to be intelligible, would need to be more distinctly indicated (perhaps by the addition of *πολλῶν* and *ἑνος*), for otherwise the readers would not have their attention drawn off from the difference of the *prepositions*. Paul has in the second instance written not *ἀνθρώπων* again, but *ἀνθρώπου*, because the contrast to *δι' ἀνθρώπου* is *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. [See Note II., p. 37.] It was not a *man*, but the exalted *Christ*, through whom the divine call to the apostleship came to Paul at Damascus ; *αὐτὸς ὁ δεσπότης οὐρανόθεν ἐκάλεσεν οὐκ ἀνθρώπῳ χρησάμενος ὑπουργῷ*, Theodoret. And this contrast is quite just : for Christ, the incarnate Son of God, was indeed as such, in the state of His self-renunciation and humiliation, *ἄνθρωπος* (Rom. v. 15 ; 1 Cor. xv. 21), and in His human manifestation not specifically different from other men (Phil. ii. 7 ; Gal. iv. 4 ; Rom. viii. 3) ; but in His state of exaltation, since He is as respects His whole divine-human nature in heaven (Eph. i. 20 ff. ; Phil. ii. 9, iii. 20, 21), He is, although subordinate to the Father (1 Cor. iii. 23, xi. 3, xv. 28, *et al.*), partaker of the divine majesty which He had before the incarnation, and possesses in His whole person at the right hand of God divine honor and divine dominion.[4]

---

[1] Comp. Bernhardy, pp. 222, 236 ; Winer, p. 390.

[2] Semler, Morus, Koppe, and others.

[3] Koppe, "non hominum, ne cujusquam quidem hominis," "not of men, not even of any man ;" comp. Bengel, Semler, Morus, Rosenmüller.

[4] Comp. generally, Usteri, *Lehrbegr.* p. 327 ; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 306.

[See Note III., p. 37.] — *καὶ Θεοῦ πατρός*] Following out the contrast, we should expect *καὶ ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρ.* But availing himself of the variety of form in which his idea could be set forth, Paul comprehends the properly two-fold relation under one preposition, since, in point of fact, with respect to the modification in the import of the *διά*, no reader could doubt that here the principle cause is conceived also as mediate. As to this usage of *διά* in popular language, see on 1 Cor. i. 9. Christ is the mediate agent of Paul's apostleship, inasmuch as Christ was the instrument *through* which God called him ; but *God* also, who nevertheless was the principal cause, may be conceived of under the relation of *διά* (comp. iv. 7 ; Lachmann), inasmuch as Christ made him His apostle, *οὐκ ἄνευ Θεοῦ πατρός*, but, on the contrary, *through the working of God*, that is, through the interposition of the divine will, which exerted its determining influence in the act of calling (comp. 1 Cor. i. 1 ; 2 Cor. i. 1 ; Eph. i. 7 ; Col. i. 1 ; 1 Tim. i. 1 ; 2 Tim. i. 1.)[1] — The words *Θεοῦ πατρός* (which together have the nature of a *proper name:* comp. Phil. ii. 11 ; Eph. vi. 23 ; 1 Pet. i. 2), according to the context, cf. Rom. vi. 4, present God as the Father *of Jesus Christ*, not as Father *generally* (de Wette ; comp. Hilgenfeld), nor as *our* Father (Paulus, Usteri, Wieseler). [See Note IV., p. 37.] The Father is named *after* the Son by way of *climax* (comp. Eph. v. 5) : in describing the superhuman origin of his apostleship Paul proceeds from the *Higher* to the *Highest* [see Note V., p. 38], without whom (see what follows), Christ could not have called him. Of course the calling by Christ is the element *decisive* of the true *ἀποστολή* (Wieseler); but it would remain so, even if Paul, advancing to the more definite agent, had named Christ *after* God. The supposition of a dogmatic precaution (Theodoret, *ἵνα μή τις ὑπολάβῃ ὑπουργὸν εἶναι τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν υἱόν, εὑρὼν προσκείμενον τὸ διά, ἐπήγαγε καὰ Θεοῦ πατρός*, "In order that no one might suppose that the Son is the subordinate of the Father, after having used the adjacent *διά*, he added *καὶ Θεοῦ πατρός* ;" comp. Chrysostom, Calovius, and others) would be as irrelevant and inappropriate as Rückert's opinion is arbitrary, that Paul at first intended merely to write *διὰ* 'I. X., and then added as an after-thought, but inexactly (therefore without *ἀπό*), *καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς*. — *τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν*] For Paul was called to be an apostle by the Christ who had been *raised up* bodily from the dead by the Father (1 Cor. xv. 8, ix. 1 ; Acts ix. 22, 26) ; so that these words involve a historical confirmation of that *καὶ Θεοῦ πατρός* in its special relation as thoroughly *assuring* the full apostolic commission of Paul :[2] they are not a mere designation of God as *originator of the work of redemption* (de Wette), which does not correspond to the definite connection with *ἀπόστολος*. According to Wieseler, the addition is intended to *awaken faith* both in Jesus as the Son and in God as our reconciled Father. But apart from the fact that the Father is here the Father of *Christ*, the idea of *reconciliation* does not suggest itself at this stage ; and the whole self-description, which is appended to Παῦλος, is introduced solely by his consciousness of *full apostolic authority:* it describes by contrast and historically what in other epistles is expressed by the simple κλητὸς ἀπόστολος. The opinion that Paul is pointing at the reproach made against him *of not having seen Christ,*[1] and that he here claims the pre-eminence of having been the only one called by the *exalted* Jesus (Augustine, Erasmus, Beza, Menochius, Estius, and others), is inappropriate, for the simple reason that the resurrection of Christ is mentioned in the form of a predicate of *God* (not of Christ). This reason also holds good against Matthies (comp. Winer), who thinks that the *divine elevation of Christ* is the point intended to be conveyed. Chrysostom and Oecumenius found even a reference directed *against the validity of the Mosaical law,* and Luther (comp. Calovius) *against the trust in one's own righteousness.* [See Note VI., p. 38.]

---

[1] Comp. Plat. *Symp.* p. 186 E, διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τουτοῦ κυβερνᾶται, and Rom. xi. 36, δι' αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα ; Winer, p. 354 f.

[2] Comp. Beyschlag in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1864, p. 225.

Ver. 2. Καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί] ἀδελφοί denotes nothing more than *fellow-Christians;* but the words σὺν ἐμοί place the persons here intended in special connection with the person of the apostle (comp. ii. 3; Phil. iv. 21): *the fellow-Christians who are in my company.* This is rightly understood as referring to his travelling companions, who were respectively his official assistants, at the time,[2] just as Paul, in many other epistles, has conjoined the name of official associates with his own (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1). Instead of mentioning their names,[3] which were perhaps known to the Galatians at least in part—possibly from his last visit to them (Acts xviii. 23) or in some other way—he uses the emphatic πάντες (which, however, by no means implies any very large number, as Erasmus and others, including Olshausen, have supposed), indicating that these brethren collectively desired to address the very same instructions, warnings, exhortations, etc., to the Galatians, whereby the impressive effect of the epistle, especially as regards the apostle's opponents, *could not but be strengthened,* and therefore was certainly *intended to be* so strengthened (comp. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jerome, Erasmus, Calvin, and others). At the same time, there is no need to assume that his opponents had spread abroad the suggestion that some one in the personal circle of the apostle did not agree with him in his teaching (Wieseler); actual indications of this must have been found in the epistle. Others have thought of *all the Christians in the place where he was then sojourning* (Erasmus, Estius, Grotius, Calovius, and others; also Schott). This is quite opposed to the analogy of all the other epistles of the N. T., not one of which is composed in the name of a church along with that of the writer. It would, in that case, have been more suitable that Paul should have either omitted σὺν ἐμοί (comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 20), or expressed himself in such a way as to intimate, not that the church was σὺν αὐτῷ, but that he was σὺν αὐτοῖς. To refer it (with Beza) to the *office-bearers* of the church, is quite arbitrary; for the readers could not recognize this in σὺν ἐμοί without further explanation. — ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατ.] consequently a *circular* epistle to the several *independent* churches. The relations of the churches were different in Achaia: see on 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1. The fact that Paul adds no epithet of honor (as κλητοῖς ἁγίοις, "called to be saints," or the like) is considered by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and by Winer, Credner, Olshausen (comp. Rückert), Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, a sign of indignation. Comp. Grotius, "quia coeperant ab evangelio declinare," "because they were beginning to decline from the gospel." And justly so; because it is in keeping with the displeasure and chagrin which induce him afterwards to refrain from all such favorable testimony as he elsewhere usually bears to the Christian behavior of his readers, and, on the contrary, to begin at once with blame (ver. 6). In no other epistle, not even in the two earliest, 1 and 2 Thess., has he employed an address so abrupt, and one so unaccompanied by any complimentary recognition; it is not sufficient, therefore, to appeal to the earlier and later "usage of the apostle" (Hofmann).

---

[1] Calvin, Morus, Semler, Koppe, Borger; comp. Ellicott.

[2] Comp. Pareus, Hammond, Semler, Michaelis, Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Winer, Paulus, Rückert, Usteri, Wieseler, Reithmayr.

[3] Which indeed he might have done, even if the epistle had been, as an exception, written by his own hand (but see on vi. 11); so that Hofmann's view is erroneous.

Ver. 3. Θεοῦ πατρός] refers *here*, according to the context, to the *Christians*, who through Christ have received the υἱοθεσία. See iv. 26 ff.; Rom. viii. 15.— See, further, on Rom. i. 7.

Ver. 4. This addition prepares the readers thus early for the recognition of their error; for their adhesion to Judaism was indeed entirely opposed to the aim of the atoning death of Jesus. Comp. ii. 20, iii. 13 ff. "See how he directs every word against self-righteousness," Luther's gloss. [See Note VII., p. 38]. — τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτόν] that is, who did not withhold (ἐφείσατο, Rom. viii. 32), but *surrendered Himself*, namely, to be put to death.[1] This special application of the words was obvious of itself to the Christian consciousness, and is placed beyond doubt by the addition περὶ τ. ἁμαρτ. ἡμ. Comp. Matt. xx. 28; Eph. v. 25; Tit. ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 6; 1 Macc. vi. 44; and Wetstein *in loc.* — περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτ. ἡμ.] *in respect of our sins* (Rom. viii. 3), *on account of them*, namely, *in order to atone for them.* See Rom. iii. 23 ff.; Gal. iii. 12 ff. In essential sense περί is not different from ὑπέρ,[2] and the idea of satisfaction is implied, not in the signification of the preposition, but in the whole nature of the case.[3] As to περί and ὑπέρ in respect to the death of Jesus, the latter of which (never περί) is always used by Paul when the reference to *persons* is expressed, see further on 1 Cor. i. 13, xv. 3. — ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ.] *End*, which that self-surrender was to attain. The ἐνεστὼς αἰών is usually understood as equivalent to ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, ὁ νῦν αἰών, "this world, the present world." Certainly in practical meaning ἐνεστώς may denote *present* (hence in the grammarians, ὁ ἐνεστὼς χρόνος, *tempus praesens*), but always only with the definite reference suggested by the literal signification, *setting in*, that is, *in the course of entrance*, that which has already *begun*.[1] Now, as this definite reference of its meaning would be quite unsuitable to designate the αἰὼν οὗτος, because the latter is not an aeon *just begun*, but one running its course from the beginning and lasting until the παρουσία; and as elsewhere Paul always describes this *present* αἰών as the αἰὼν οὗτος (Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. i. 20; and frequently: comp. ὁ νῦν αἰών, 1 Tim. vi. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 10; Tit. ii. 12), we must explain it as *the period of time which is already in the act of setting in*, the evil time which has already *begun*, that is, the time *immediately* preceding the παρουσία, so that the αἰὼν ἐνεστώς is the last *part* of the αἰὼν οὗτος. [See Note VIII., p. 38.] — This αἰὼν ἐνεστώς is not only very *full of sorrow* through the *dolores Messiae* (see on 1 Cor. vii. 26), to which, however, the ethical πονηρός in our passage does *not* refer; but it is also in the highest degree *immoral*, inasmuch as many fall away from the faith, and the antichristian principle develops great power and audacity (2 Thess. ii. 3 ff.; 1 Tim. iv. 1 ff.; 2 Tim. iii. 1 ff.; 2 Pet. iii. 3; Jude 18; 1 John ii. 18; Matt. xxiv. 10–12).[2] *On that account* this period of time is pre-eminently ὁ αἰὼν πονηρός. With his idea of the nearness of the παρουσία, Paul conceived this period as having then already begun (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 7), although its full development was still in reserve (2 Thess. ii. 8). Accordingly, the same period is here designated ὁ αἰὼν ἐνεστώς which in other places is called καιρὸς ἔσχατος (1 Pet. i. 5), ἔσχαται ἡμέραι (Acts ii. 17; 2 Tim. iii. 1), ἐσχάτη ὥρα (1 John ii. 18), and in Rabbinic קֵץ or סוֹף or אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים (Isa. ii. 2; Jer. xxiii. 20; Mic. iv. 1).[3] Christ, says Paul, desired by means of His atoning death to *deliver* us *out of* this wicked period, that is, *to place us out of fellowship with it* [see Note IX., p. 38], inasmuch as through His death the guilt of believers was blotted out, and through faith, by virtue of the Holy Spirit, the new moral life—the life in the Spirit—was brought about in them (Rom. vi. 8). Christians have become objects of God's love and holy, and as such are now taken out of that αἰὼν πονηρός, so that, although living in this αἰών they yet have nothing in common with its πονηρία.[4] The ἐξέληται, moreover, has the emphasis and is accordingly prefixed. For how antagonistic to this *separation*, designed by Christ, was the *fellowship* with the αἰὼν πονηρός into which the readers had relapsed through their devotion to the false teachers! —Observe, moreover, that the αἰὼν πονηρός forms one idea, and therefore it was not necessary to repeat the article before *πονηρου* (as Matthias contends).[1] — *κατὰ τὸ θέλημα κ.τ.λ.*] strengthens the weight of the *ὅπως ἐξέληται κ.τ.λ.*, to which it belongs. Comp. Eph. i. 4 f. ; Col. i. 13 f. The salvation *was willed by God*, to whom Christ was *obedient* (Phil. ii. 8) ; the reference of *κατὰ τ. θελ. κ.τ.λ.* to the whole sentence from *τοῦ δόντος* onwards[2] is less simple and unnecessary. The connection with *πονηροῦ*[3] would only be possible, if the latter were predicative, and would yield an idea entirely paradoxical. — *τ. Θεοῦ κ. πατρ. ἡμ.*] of God, who (through Christ) is our Father. Comp. Phil. iv. 20 ; 1 Thess. i. 3, iii. 11, 13. As to the *καί*, comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 24 ; Eph. i. 3 : from the latter passage it must not be concluded that *ἡμῶν* belongs also to *Θεοῦ*.[4] The more definite designation *κ. πατρ. ἡμῶν* conveys the *motive* of the *θέλημα*, *love*.

---

[1] Comp. Clem. *Cor.* I. 49, τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, "His blood He gave for you." For instances from Greek authors of ἔδωκεν ἑαυτόν, see Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 348.

[2] 1 Pet. iii. 18; Matt. xxvi. 28; Heb. x. 26, xiii. 11; Xen. *Mem.* i. 1. 17; Eur. *Alc.* 176, comp. 701; Hom. *Il.* xii. 243, comp. i. 444; see Buttmann, *Ind. ad Mid.* p. 188; Schaefer, *App. Dem.* I. p. 190; Bremi, *ad Dem. Ol.* p. 188, Goth.

[3] Hom. *Il.* i. 444: Φοίβῳ . . . ἑκατόμβην ῥέξαι ὑπὲρ Δαναῶν, "to offer a hecatomb to Phoebus, *for the benefit of the Danai*," ὄφρ' ἱλασόμεσθα ἄνακτα, "to appease the king."

---

[1] So not merely in passages such as Dem. 255. 9, 1466. 21; Herodian, ii. 2. 3; Polyb. i. 75. 2; 3 Esd. v. 47, ix. 6; 3 Macc. i. 16, but also in Xen. *Hell.* ii. 1. 5; Plat. *Legg.* ix. p. 878; Dinarch. i. 93; Polyb. i. 83. 2, i. 60. 9, vii. 5. 4; 2 Macc. iii. 17, vi. 9; comp. Schweighäuser, *Lex. Polyb.* p. 219; Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 350. So also universally in the N. T, Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. iii. 22, vii. 26; 2 Thess. ii. 2 (comp. 2 Tim. iii. 1; Heb. ix. 9).

[2] Comp. Usteri, *l.c.* p. 348 ff.; Lücke and Huther on 1 John ii. 18.

[3] See Schoettgen, *Hor. ad 2 Tim.* iii. 1.

[4] It is therefore self-evident how unjust is the objection taken by Hilgenfeld to our interpretation, that it limits the Redeemer's death to this short period of transition. This the apostle in no way does, but he portrays redemption concretely, displaying the whole importance and greatness of its salvation by the force of strongest contrast. This remark also applies to Wieseler's objection. Comp. Barnabas, *Ep.* 10, where the righteous man, walking in this world, τὸν ἅγιον αἰῶνα ἐκδέχεται, "looks forward to the holy world."

Ver. 5. To the mention of this counsel of deliverance the piety of the apostle annexes a doxology. Comp. 1 Tim. i. 17 ; Rom. ix. 5, xi. 36, xvi. 27 ; Eph. iii. 21. — *ἡ δόξα*] that is, the *honor due* to Him for this *θέλημα*. We have to supply *εἴη*, and not *ἐστί* (Vulgate, Hofmann, Matthias), which *is inserted* (Rom. i. 25 ; 1 Pet. iv. 11) where there is *no* doxology. So in the frequent doxologies in the apostolic Fathers, *e.g.* Clement, *Cor.* I. 20, 38, 43, 45, 50, 58.[5]

Ver. 6. Without prefixing, as in other epistles, even in those to the Corinthians, a conciliatory preamble setting forth what was commendable in his readers, Paul at once plunges *in mediam rem.* He probably wrote without delay, immediately on receiving the accounts which arrived as to the falling away of his readers, while his mind was still in that state of agitated feeling which prevented him from using his customary preface of thanksgiving and conciliation,—a painful irritation (*πυροῦμαι*, 2 Cor. xi. 29), which was the more just, that in the case of the Galatians, the very foundation and substance of his gospel threatened to fall to pieces. — *θαυμάζω*] often used by Greek orators in the sense of surprise at something *blameworthy.*[6] In the N.T., comp. Mark vi. 6 ; John vii. 21 ; 1 John iii. 13. — *οὕτω ταχέως*] *so very quickly*, so recently, may denote either the *rapid development* of the apostasy (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 2 ; 1 Tim. v. 22 ; Wisd. xiv. 28), as Chrysostom (*οὐδὲ χρόνου δέονται οἱ ἀπατῶντες ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.*), Theophylact, Koppe, Schott, de Wette, Windischmann, Ellicott, Hofmann, Reithmayr understand it ; or its *early occurrence* (1 Cor. iv. 19 ; Phil. ii. 19, *et al.*), whether reckoned from the last visit of the apostle (Bengel, Flatt, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler) or from the conversion of the readers (Usteri, Olshausen). The latter is preferable, because it corresponds with *ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος κ.τ.λ.*, whereby the time of the *calling* is indicated as the *terminus a quo.* Comp. iii. 1–3. [See Note X., p. 38 seq.] This view is not inconsistent with the fact that the epistle was written a considerable time after the conversion of the readers ; for, at all events, they had been Christians for but a few years, which the *οὕτω ταχέως* as a *relative* idea still suits well enough. By their *μετατίθεσθαι* they showed themselves to be πρόσκαιροι (Matt. xiii. 21), and this *surprises* the apostle. As to οὕτω, comp. on iii. 3. — μετατίθεσθε] μετατίθημι, *to transpose*, in the middle, *to alter one's opinion*, to become of another mind, and generally *to fall away.*[1] It might also be understood in a *passive* sense (Theodorus of Mopsuestia, μετατίθ., not μετάγεσθε, is used : ὡς ἐπὶ ἀψύχων, "as to the faint-hearted ;" Beza, "verbum passivum usurpavit, ut culpam in pseudo-apostolos derivet," "He has employed a passive verb, in order to cast the blame upon the false apostles"). But the use of the middle in this sense is the *common* one ; so that the passive sense, and the nicety which, according to Beza, is involved in it, must have been more definitely indicated to the reader in order to be recognized. The *present tense* denotes that the readers were still *in the very act* of the falling away, which began so soon after their conversion. According to Jerome, the word itself is intended to convey an allusion to the name Galatia : "Galatia enim translationem in nostra lingua sonat," "for in our tongue, Galatia means transferral" (גָּלָה ; hence גּוֹלָה, גָּלוּת, *carrying away*). Although approved by Bertholdt, this idea is nevertheless an empty figment, because *the thing* suggested the expression, and these Hebrew words denote the μετατίθεσθαι in the sense of *exile.*[2] But from an *historical* point of view, the appeals of Grotius and Wetstein to the fickleness of the *Gallic* character[3] are not without interest as regards the *Galatians.* — ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι Χ.][4] The τοῦ καλέσαντος is not to be taken with Χριστοῦ, as Syr., Jerome, Erasmus (in the version, not in the paraphrase and annotations), Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, and others, also Morus and Flatt, understand it ; against which may be urged, not (with Matthies and Schott) the want of the article before Χριστοῦ (see on Rom. ix. 5 ; comp. also 1 Pet. i. 15), but the fact that the calling into the kingdom of the Messiah is presented by Paul (and the apostles generally) so constantly as the work of *God*, that we must not deviate from this analogy in explaining the words.[5] Thence, also, τοῦ καλέσ. is not to be taken as *neuter*, and referred to the *gospel* (Ewald) ; but ὁ καλέσας is *God*, and Χριστοῦ belongs to ἐν χάριτι, *from him who has called you through the grace of Christ.* [See Note XI. p. 39.] Ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ is *instrumental ;* for the grace of Christ (Acts xv. 11 ; Rom. v. 15 ; 2 Cor. viii. 9 ; Tit. iii. 6 : comp. also Rom. xvi. 20 ; 2 Cor. xii. 9, xiii. 13 ; Philem. 25), viz., the favor of Christ unmerited by sinful men, according to which He gave up His life to atone for them (comp. ver. 4), is that *by which*, *i.e.*, by the *preaching of which*, the divine calling reaches its subjects ; comp. Acts xiv. 3, xx. 24. So καλεῖν with ἐν, 1 Cor. vii. 15 ; Eph. iv. 4 ; 1 Thess. iv. 7 ; to which passages the interpretation "*on the ground of* grace"[6] is not suitable. *Others* take ἐν for εἰς ;[7] so that by brevity of language ἐν, indicating the result of the direction, includes within it this also ; see Winer, p. 388. This is unnecessarily forced, for such a *constructio praegnans* in Greek and in the N. T. is undisputed only in the case of verbs of motion (as ἔρχεσθαι, εἰσιέναι, ἐμπίπτειν, κ.τ.λ.).[1] In point of sense, moreover, this view is liable to the objection that the κλῆσις always refers to *the Messianic kingdom*,[2] and the grace of Christ is *that which procures* the Messianic σωτηρία (Rom. v. 15, *et al.*), and not the σωτηρία itself. On the absence of the article before χάριτι, see Winer, p. 118 f.—Observe, moreover, how the whole mode of setting forth the apostasy makes the readers sensible of its antagonism to God and salvation ! Comp. Chrysostom and Theodoret. — εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγ] *to a gospel of a different kind*, from that, namely, which was preached to you when God called you. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 4. The contrast is based on the previous designation of their calling as having taken place ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ (not somehow by the law),—a statement clearly enough indicating the specific nature of the *Pauline* gospel, from which the nature of the Judaistic teaching, although the Galatians had likewise received the latter as the gospel for which it had been passed off, was withal so different (ἑτερον). Comp. ver. 8.

---

[1] See Krüger, § 57. 2. 3.

[2] Bengel, Wieseler, probably also Hofmann.

[3] Matthias.

[4] Hofmann.

[5] Comp. the customary *εὐλογητός*, *sc.* *εἴη*, at Rom. ix. 5 ; Eph. i. 3. See, further, on Eph. iii. 21.

[6] Dem. 349. 3 ; Sturz, *Lex. Xen.* II. p. 511 ; Abresch, *Diluc. Thuc.* p. 309.

---

[1] With εἰς, App. *Hisp.* 17 ; Ecclus. vi. 8 ; with πρός, Polyb. xxvi. 2. 6. See Wetstein *in loc.* ; Kypke, II. p. 273 ; Ast. *ad Plat. de Leg.* p. 497 ; from the LXX., Schleusner, *s.v.* ; and from Philo, Loesner, p. 325.

[2] See Gesenius, *Thes.* I. p. 285.

[3] Caes. *B. Gall.* iii. 19, iv. 5, ii. 1, iii. 10.

[4] On ἀπό, *away from*, comp. 2 Macc. vii. 24 ; and see generally, Kühner, § 622 c.

[5] See on Rom. i. 6 ; and Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 387.

[6] Wieseler.

[7] Vulgate, Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Beza, etc., also Borger and Rückert.

Ver. 7. The expression just used, εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, was a paradoxical one, for in the true sense there is only one gospel : it seems to presuppose the existence of several εὐαγγέλια, but only serves to bring into clearer light the misleading efforts of the Judaists, and in this sense the apostle now *explains* it. — ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, εἰ μή κ.τ.λ] *which* ἑτερον εὐαγγέλιον, to which ye have fallen away, *is not another*, not a second gospel, alongside of *that* by means of which ye were called (ἄλλο, not ἑτερον again), *except there are certain persons who perplex you*, etc. That is, *this* ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον *is not another* by the side of the former, *only there are certain persons who perplex you ;* so that in this respect only can we speak of ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον as if it were an ἄλλο.[3] It must be observed that the emphasis is laid first on οὐκ and then on ἄλλο ; so that, although Paul has previously said εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, he yet guards the oneness of the gospel, and represents that to which he applied the words ἑτερον εὐαγγ as *only the corruption and perversion of the one* (of the εὐαγγ. τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ). Thus εἰ μή retains its general meaning *nisi*, *unless*, without any need to assume (with Matthies) an abbreviation for εἰ μὴ ἄλλο ἐστὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ὅτι τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες κ.τ.λ., "unless there is another, for the reason that there are some who disturb you."[4] The two emphatic words ἕτερον and ἄλλο preserve, however, their distinction in sense: ἄλλο meaning absolutely *another*, that is, a second likewise existing (in addition to the one gospel); and ἕτερον *one of another kind, different.*[1] [See Note XII., p. 39.] The interpretation *most generally received*[2] connects ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο merely with εὐαγγέλιον,[3] and for the most part understands εἰ μή adversatively, "*Neque tamen est ulla alia doctrina de Jesu Christo vera; sunt vero homines,*" "nor is any other doctrine of Jesus Christ true; but there are men," etc., Koppe. Against this interpretation may be urged, first, the fact that ἕτερον previously had the chief emphasis laid on it, and is therefore quite unwarrantably excluded from the reference of the relative which follows, secondly, that Paul must have logically used some such expression as μὴ ὄντος ἀλλοῦ; and lastly, that εἰ μή never means anything else than *nisi*, *unless*, not even in passages such as ii. 16; Matt. xii. 4 (see on this passage); Luke iv. 26 · 1 Cor. vii. 17; and Rev. ix. 4, xxi. 27.[4] *Others*, as Calvin, Grotius (not Calovius), Homberg, Winer, Rückert, Olshausen, refer ὅ to the whole contents of ὅτι οὕτω ταχέως . . . εὐαγγέλιον, "*quod quidem* (*sc.* vos deficere a Christo) *non est aliud, nisi*, etc., *the case, viz., your departure from Christ is not otherwise than.*"[5] But by this interpretation the whole point of the relation, so Pauline in its character, which ὅ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο bears to ἕτερον, is lost; and why should the more special explanation of the *deficere a Christo* be annexed in so emphatic a form, and not by a simple γάρ or the like? Lastly, Schott[6] regards ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο as a parenthesis, and makes εἰ μή τινες κ.τ.λ. depend on θαυμάζω κ.τ.λ.; so that that, which is expressed in the words θαυμάζω κ.τ.λ., by εἰ μή τινες κ.τ.λ. "*limitibus circumscribatur proferenda defectionis causa, qua perpendenda illud θαυμάζειν vel minuatur vel tollatur,*" "is circumscribed by limits to set forth the cause of the defection, by weighing which the θαυμάζειν is either diminished or removed." This is incorrect, for logically Paul must have written ἐθαύμαζον ἄν . . . εἰ μή τινες ἦσαν; and with what arbitrary artifice ὅ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο is thus set aside, and, as it were, abandoned, and yet the reference of the ὅ to the emphatic ἕτερον is assumed! — οἱ ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς] The participle with the article designates the τινές as those whose characteristic was the ταράσσειν of the Galatians, as persons who dealt in this, who were occupied with it.[7] [See Note XIII., p. 39.] On ταράσσειν, in the sense of perplexing the faith and principles, comp. here and v. 10, especially Acts xv. 24 ; Ecclus. xxviii. 9. — *καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι*] "re ipsa non poterant, volebant tamen obnixe," "they really were not able, yet they earnestly wished it," Bengel ; "*volunt* . . . sed non *valent*," "they wish, but are not capable," Jerome. On the other hand, the *ταράσσειν* of the *Galatians* actually took place. — The article before *ταρ.* refers to *θέλοντες* as well.[1] — *μεταστρέψαι*, to *pervert*, that is, to alter so that it acquires an entirely opposite nature.[2] — *τὸ εὐαγγ. τοῦ* X.] see generally on Mark i. 1. The genitive is here not *auctoris*, of the *author*, but, as expressing the specific characteristic of the one only gospel in contradistinction to those who were perplexing the Galatians, *objecti*, the genitive of the object (*concerning Christ*). This is evident from ver. 6, where *ἐν χάριτι* Χριστοῦ indicates the *contents* of the gospel.

---

[1] Comp. also Hartung, *über d. Kas.* p. 68 f.

[2] 1 Thess. ii. 12 ; 1 Tim. vi. 12 ; 2 Thess. ii. 14 ; 1 Pet. v. 10 ; Rev. xix. 9, *et al. ;* also 1 Cor. i. 9, and passages such as Col. iii. 15 ; 1 Thess. iv. 7.

[3] So in substance Wieseler and Hoffmann; comp. Matthias.

[4] Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* vi. 5, takes εἰ μή ironically, and τινές in the well-known sense, *people of importance* (see on Acts v. 36, and Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 731) : "*nisi forte magni est facienda eorum auctoritas, qui*," etc., "unless perchance their influence is to be highly esteemed, who," etc. But the article which follows renders this interpretation not at all necessary (see below). Besides, in this sense *Paul* uses unly the *neuter* (see ii. 6, vi. 3 ; 1 Cor. iii. 7). Lastly, he is fond of designating false teachers, adversaries, etc., as τινές, that is, *quidam, quos nominare nolo*, "some whom I am unwilling to mention." (Hermann, *ad Viger. l.c.*). See 1 Cor. iv. 18 ; 2 Cor. iii. 1 ; Gal. ii. 12 ; 1 Cor. xv. 12 ; 1 Tim. i. 3.

---

[1] ἕτερον και ἀνόμοιον, "different and dissimilar." Plat. *Conv.* p. 186 B. Dem. 911. 7; Soph. *Phil.* 501, *O. C.* 1446; Xen. *Anab.* vi. 4. 8 (and Krüger *in loc.*); Wisd. vii. 5; Judith viii. 20. In the N. T., comp. especially 1 Cor. xii. 8–10, xv. 40; 2 Cor. xi. 4; Acts iv. 12; also 1 Cor. xiv. 21; Rom. vii. 23; Mark xvi. 12; Luke ix. 29. Comp. also the expression ἕτερον παρά τι, Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 71 A., *Rep.* p. 337 E.

[2] Peschito, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theodoret, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Beza, Wolf, Bengel, and many others; also Morus, Koppe, Borger, Flatt, Usteri, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Reithm.

[3] So already the Marcionites, who proved from this passage that there was no other gospel than theirs! See Chrysostom *in loc.*

[4] Comp. Hom. *Od.* xii. 325 f., οὐδέ τις ἄλλος γίγνετ' ἔπειτ' ἀνέμων, εἰ μὴ Εὐρός τε Νότος τε, "no other wind then arose, save only the east and the south," and the passages in Poppo, *ad Thuc.* III. 1, p. 216.

[5] Winer.

[6] So also Cornelius à Lapide

[7] Comp. the very usual εἰσὶν οἱ λέγοντες; also Luke xviii. 9; Col. ii. 8. See generally Winer, p. 104; Krüger, § 50. 4. 3; Fritzsche, *Quaest. Luk.* p. 18; Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 238.

Ver. 8. Ἀλλά, not *but*, as an antithesis to *οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο* (Hofmann), which has already been fully disposed of by *εἰ μή κ.τ.λ.* It is rather the *however* confronting most emphatically the *τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες κ.τ.λ.* "There are some, etc. ; *whoso, however, so behaves, let him be accursed!*" This curse pronounced by the apostle on his opponents is *indirect*, but, because it is brought about by a conclusion *a majori ad minus*, all the more *emphatic.* — *καὶ ἐάν*] to be taken together, *even in the case that.*[3] — *ἡμεῖς*] applies primarily and chiefly to the apostle himself, but the *σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί* (ver. 2) are also included. [See Note XIV., p. 39.] To embrace in the reference the associates of the apostle in *founding the Galatian churches*[4] is premature, for these are only presented to the reader in the *εὐηγγελισάμεθα* which follows. — *ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*] to be taken together : an angel *οὐρανόθεν καταβάς* (Hom. *Il.* xi. 184). Comp. *ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανῷ*, Matt. xxii. 30. [See Note XV., p. 39.] If Paul rejects both his own and angelic authority—consequently even the supposed superhuman intervention (comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 1)—with reference to the case assumed, as accursed,[5] *every one without exception* (comp. *ὅστις ἄν ᾖ*, v. 10) is in the same case subject to the same curse. The certainty, that no other gospel but that preached by the apostle to his readers was the true one, cannot be more decisively confirmed. — *παρ' ὅ εὐηγγελισ. ὑμῖν*] This ὅ, which is not to be explained by *εὐαγγέλιον*,[6] is simply *that which*, namely, as the context shows, the *contents* of the gospel ; "*beyond that* which we," etc.[7] This may mean either *praeterquam*, "besides,"[8] or *contra*, "against."[9] For the two meanings, see Matthiae, p. 1381 ; Winer, p. 377. In earlier times a dogmatic interest was involved in this point : the Lutherans, in order to combat tradition, laying the stress on *praeterquam;* and the Catholics, to protect the same, on *contra.*[1] The *contra*, or more exactly, the *sense of specific difference*, is most suitable to the context (see ver. 6, ἕτερον εὐαγγέλ.). Comp. Rom. xvi. 17. [See Note XVI., p. 39.] — εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν] that is, "I and my companions at the time of your conversion" (comp. παρελάβετε, ver. 9). The emphasis, however, lies on παρ'. — ἀνάθεμα ἔστω] *Let him be subject to the divine wrath and everlasting perdition* (חֵרֶם), the same as κατάρα and ἐπικατάρατος, iii. 13; see on Rom. ix. 3. The opposite, vi. 16. To apply it[2] to the idea of *excommunication* subsequently expressed in the church[3] by the word ἀνάθεμα, is contrary to the usage of the N. T. (Rom. ix. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22), and is besides in this passage erroneous, because even a false-teaching *angel* is supposed in the protasis. Comp., on the contrary, v. 10, βαστάσει τὸ κρῖμα; 2 Thess. i. 9. See generally the thoroughly excellent discussion of Wieseler, p. 39 ff. Mark, moreover, in the use of the preceptive rather than the mere optative form, the expression of the apostolic ἐξουσία, *Let him be!*

---

[1] See Seidler, *ad Eur. El.* 429 ; Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 52 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 1. 19.

[2] Comp. LXX. 1 Sam. x. 9 ; Ecclus. xi. 31 ; Hom. *Il.* xv. 203 ; Dem. 1032. 1.

[3] See Herm. *ad Viger.* p. 832 ; Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 140 f.

[4] Hofmann.

[5] Comp. Ignatius, *ad Smyrn.* 6, where it is said even of the *angels*, *ἐὰν μὴ πιστεύσωσιν εἰς τὸ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, κἀκείνοις κρίσις ἐστίν*, "unless they believe in the blood of Christ, there is judgment even to them."

[6] Schott, Flatt, Hofmann.

[7] Bernhardy, p. 259.

[8] Vulgate, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Beza, Calovius, Rambach, Reithm. and others.

[9] So Theodoret and the older Catholics, Grotius, and many others ; also Winer, Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Wieseler, Hofmann.

Ver. 9. Again the same curse;[4] but now the addition of an allusion to an earlier utterance of it increases still more its solemn earnestness. — ὡς προειρήκαμεν] is referred by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Luther, Erasmus, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, and most of the earlier expositors, also Flatt, Winer, Matthies, Neander, to ver. 8. But in this case Paul would have written merely ὡς εἰρήκαμεν, πάλιν λέγω, or simply πάλιν ἐρῶ, as in Phil. iv. 4. The compound verb προειρήκαμεν (v. 21; 2 Cor. vii. 3, xiii. 2; 1 Thess. iv. 6) and καὶ ἄρτι point necessarily to an *earlier* time, *in contrast to the present.* Hence the Peschito, Jerome,[5] Semler, Koppe, Borger, Rückert, Usteri, Schott, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, and others, rightly take it as indicating the *presence* of the apostle among the Galatians at the time when he uttered this curse; comp. v. 3. We must, however, look upon this presence as the *second* and not the *first* visit;[6] for the expression in the form of *curse* betrays an *advanced* stage of the *danger*, and not a merely *prophylactic* measure. — καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω] apodosis, "*so say I also now* (at the present moment) *again;*" so that πάλιν thus glances back to *the* time to which the προ applied. Rückert regards ὡς . . . λέγω together as the *protasis* (comp. Ewald), in which case the proper apodosis, *so it is in fact*, before εἴ τις would be *wanting.* Or rather, if ὡς . . . λέγω were the protasis, εἴ τις ὑμᾶς . . . ἀνάθεμα ἔστω would be the real apodosis. But why introduce at all such a forced departure from the separation, which presents itself so naturally, and is so full of emphasis, of ὡς . . . λέγω into protasis and apodosis? The reference of προειρήκ. to an earlier time is certain enough; and ἄρτι, *now*, in the sense of the point of time then present, is very usual in Greek authors[7] and in the N. T. — εἴ τις ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.] Paul does not here, as in ver.

---

[1] See Calovius and Estius.

[2] Rosenmüller, Baumgarten-Crusius, comp. also Grotius and Semler.

[3] Suicer, *Thes.* I. p. 270.

[4] "Deliberate loquitur," "he speaks deliberately," Bengel.

[5] Comp. Augustine, who leaves a choice between the two views.

[6] Hofmann.

[7] Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 18 ff.

8, again use ἐάν with the subjunctive, but on account of the actual occurrence puts the positive εἰ,—thus giving to his utterance a *climactic* character, as in Acts v. 38 f.[1] — As to εὐαγγελίζεσϑαι with the *accusative*,[2] which does not occur elsewhere in Paul's writings, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 268. — παρελάβετε] often used of that which one gets through *instruction.*[3] It may, however, denote either *to take* (actively), as in 1 Cor. xv. 1 ; 1 John i. 11 ; Phil. iv. 9 ; or *to receive* (passively), as in ver. 12 ; 1 Thess. ii. 13 ; 1 Cor. xv. 3, *et al.* The latter is preferable here, as a parallel to εὐηγγελισάμεϑα ὑμῖν in ver. 8.

Ver. 10. Paul feels that the curse which he had just repeated twice might strike his readers as being repulsive and stern ; and in reference thereto he now gives an *explanatory justification* (γάρ) of the harsh language. [See Note XVII., p. 39.] He would not have uttered that ἀνάϑεμα ἔστω, if he had been concerned at present to influence men in his favor, and not God, etc. — ἄρτι] has the chief emphasis, corresponds to the ἄρτι in ver. 9, and is therefore to be understood, not, as it usually is,[4] in the wider sense of the *period of the apostle's Christian life generally*, but[5] in reference to the *present moment*, as in ver. 9, just as ἄρτι always in the N. T., corresponding to the Greek usage of the word, expresses the narrower idea *modo, nunc ipsum*, but does not represent the wider sense of νῦν (ii. 20 ; 2 Cor. v. 16 ; Matt. xxvi. 53, *et al.*), which is not even the case in the passages in Lobeck, p. 20. Hence, often as νῦν in Paul's writings covers the whole period from his conversion, ἄρτι is never used in this sense, not even in 1 Cor. xiii. 12. The latter rather singles out from the more general compass of the νῦν the present moment specially, as in the classical combination νῦν ἄρτι.[6] *Now*, Paul would say, *just now*, when he is induced to write this letter by the Judaizing reaction against the very essence of the true and sole gospel which he upheld,—*now*, at this critical point of time—it could not possibly be his business to conciliate men, but God only.[7] — ἀνϑρώπους] is quite *general*, and is not not to be restricted either to his *opponents*[8] or otherwise. [See Note XVIII., p. 40.] The category, which is pointed at, is negatived, and thus the generic ἀνϑρώπ. needed no article.[9] — πείϑω] *persuadeo*, whether by words or otherwise. The word never has any other *signification ;* but the more precise definition of its *meaning* results from the context. Here, where that which was repulsive in the preceding curse is to receive explanation, and the parallel is ζητῶ ἀρέσκειν, and where also the words ἢ τὸν Θεόν must fit in with the idea of πείϑω, it denotes, as often in classical authors,[1] *to win over, to conciliate and render friendly to oneself* (Acts xii. 20, and Kypke thereon).[2] Lastly, the *present* tense expresses, *I am occupied with it, I make it my business.*[3] Our explanation of πείθω substantially agrees with that of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Flacius, Hammond, Grotius, Elsner, Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Wolf, Zachariae, Morus, Koppe, and others; also Borger, Flatt, Winer, Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ewald (who, however, restricts the reference of ἢ τὸν Θεόν, which there is nothing to limit, to the day of judgment), Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, and others. The interpretations which differ from this, such as "*humana suadeo* or *doceo, an divina*," "Do I advise or teach things human or divine;"[4] or "*suadeone secundum homines an secundum Deum*," "Do I advise according to men or God," thus expressing the *intention* and not the contents;[5] or "*suadeone vobis, ut hominibus credatis an ut Deo*," "Do I advise you to believe men or God,"[6] are contrary to the meaning of the word: for πείθειν τινά always means *persuadere alicui*, "to persuade some one," and is not to be identified with πείθειν τι (Acts xix. 8, xxviii. 23), placing the personal accusative under the point of view of the thing.—ἢ ζητῶ ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν] or do I strive to be an object of *human* goodwill?—not tautological, but more general than the preceding. The stress which lies on ἀνθρώποις makes any saving clause on the part of expositors[7] appear unsuitable. Even by his winning accommodation (1 Cor ix. 19 ff., x. 15) Paul sought not at all to please *men*, but rather *God.*[8]—εἰ ἔτι ἀνθρώποις ἤρεσκον κ.τ.κ.] contains the negative answer to the last question. The emphasis is placed first on ἀνθρώποις, and next on Χριστοῦ: "*If I still please men*, if I were not already beyond the possession of *human* favor, but were still well-pleasing to men, *I should not be Christ's servant.*" According to de Wette, ἔτι is intended to affirm nothing more than that, if the one existed, the other could no longer exist. But in this case ἔτι must logically have been placed after οὐκ. The *truth* of the proposition, εἰ ἔτι κ.τ.λ., in which ἀνθρώπ. is not any more than before to be limited to Paul's *opponents* (according to Holsten, even including the apostles at Jerusalem), rests upon the principle that no one can serve two masters (Matt. vi. 24), and corresponds to the οὐαί of the Lord Himself (Luke vi. 26), and to His own precedent (John vi. 41). But how decidedly, even at that period of the development of his apostolic consciousness, Paul had the full and clear conviction that he was an object, not of human goodwill, but of human hatred and calumny, is specially evident from the Epistles to the Corinthians composed soon afterwards; comp., however, even 1 Thess. ii. 4 ff. In this he recognized a mark of the servant of God and Christ

---

[1] See on the passage; Luke xiii. 9; Winer, p. 277 ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 190 ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 93 B. Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 20, 21, μήπως — μήπως — μή.

[2] The studied design which Bengel discovers in the alternation between ὑμῖν (ver. 8) and ὑμᾶς (ver. 9), "evangelio aliquem instruere convenit insultationi falsorum doctorum," "to instruct one in the Gospel is harmonious with the insolent conduct of the false teachers," is groundless. For they might say just as boastingly, "*evangelium praedicavimus vobis*," "we have preached the Gospel unto you." The change in the words is accidental.

[3] See Kypke, II. p. 222.

[4] And by Wieseler also.

[5] So Bengel, de Wette, Ellicott, Hofm., Eadie.

[6] Plat. *Polit.* p. 291 B, *Men.* p. 85 C.

[7] Comp. Hofmann.

[8] Hofmann.

[9] Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 619, 13; Sauppe, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 4, 14.

---

[1] Nägelsbach *zur Ilias.* i. 100.

[2] Comp. especially on πείθειν θεόν, Pind. *Ol.* ii. 144; Plat. *Pol.* iii. p. 390 E, ii. p. 364 C; Eur. *Med.* 964; also the passages from Josephus in Krebs.

[3] See Bernhardy, p. 370.

[4] Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Vatablus, Gomarus, Cramer, Michaelis.

[5] Calvin.

[6] Piscator, Pareus, Calixtus; so also in substance, Holsten, *z. Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 332 ff., and Hilgenfeld.

[7] As, for example, Schott, "de ejusmodi cogitari studio hominibus placendi, *quod Deo displiceat*," "of such thought as by the endeavor to please men would displease God."

[8] Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 4.

(2 Cor. vi. 4 ff., xi. 23 ff.; 1 Cor. iv. 9). The ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν is the *result* of ζητεῖν ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν, and consequently means *to please* men, not *to seek to please* or *to live to please* them, as most expositors, even Rückert, Usteri, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius,[1] quite arbitrarily assume, although apart from the context the words *might* have this meaning.[2] — Χριστοῦ δοῦλος οὐκ ἂν ἤμην] is understood by most expositors, following Chrysostom, including Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Paulus, Schott, Rückert, "so should I now be no apostle, but I should have remained a Jew, Pharisee, and persecutor of Christians;" taking, therefore, Χριστοῦ δοῦλος in an *historical* sense. But how feeble this idea would be, and how lacking the usual depth of the apostle's thought! No; Χριστοῦ δοῦλος is to be taken in its *ethical* character:[3] "Were I still well-pleasing to men, this would exclude the character of a servant of Christ, and I should not be such an one; whom men misunderstand, hate, persecute, revile." As to the relation, however, of our passage to 1 Cor. x. 32, see Calovius, who justly remarks that in the latter passage the πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω is meant *secundum Deum et ad hominum aedificationem*, "according to God and for the edification of men," and not *secundum auram et voluntatem nudam hominum*, "according to the mere favor and wish of men."

Vv. 11, 12.[4] *Theme of the apologetic portion of the epistle.* See *Introd.* sec. 2. — δέ] in continuance of the discourse. The way having been *prepared* for this theme in vv. 8–10, it is now *formally announced* for further discussion.[5] And after the impassioned outburst in vv. 6–10, the language becomes composed and calm. Now, therefore, for the first time, we find the address ἀδελφοί. [See Note XIX., p. 40.] — γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν] *but* (now to enter more particularly on the subject of my letter) *I make known to you.* This announcement has a certain solemnity,[6] which is only enhanced by the fact that the matter must have been already known to the reader. There is no need to modify the sense of γνωρίζω, which neither here nor in 1 Cor. xv. 1 means *monere vos volo* or the like.[7] — τὸ εὐαγγέλιον . . . ὅτι] attraction.[8] — τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ] *which has been announced by me*, among you and among others;[9] not to be limited to the conversion of the *readers* only. — κατὰ ἄνθρωπον] cannot indicate the mode of *announcement*, which would require us to conceive εὐαγγελισθέν as repeated.[1] Necessarily belonging to οὐκ ἔστι, it is the negative modal expression of the *gospel itself* which was preached by Paul; specifying, however, not its *origin*,[2] which κατά in itself never expresses,[3] but its *qualitative relation*, although this *is conditioned* by its origin (ver. 12). The gospel announced by me is not *according to men*, that is, *not of such quality as it would be if it were the work of men;* it is not of the same nature as human wisdom, human efficiency, and the like.[4] Looking to the context, the view of Grotius is too narrow, "nihil humani affectus admixtum habet," "He has no mingling of human feeling." Bengel hits the mark, "non est *humani census* evangelium meum, "my gospel is not according to the estimate of men."

---

[1] *To live to please, to render oneself pleasing*, is also Wieseler's interpretation (comp. also Rom. xv. 1), who consistently understands the previous ἀρέσκειν in the same way. Comp. Winer and Hofmann. But there would thus be no motive for the change from ζητῶ ἀρέσκειν, "I seek to please," to ἤρεσκον, "I pleased," only, which, according to our view, involves a very significant progress Paul *seeks* not to please, and *pleases* not.

[2] See on 1 Cor. x. 33; and comp. ἀνθρωπάρεσκος, Eph. vi. 6.

[3] Erasmus, Grotius, Bengel, Semler, Zachariae, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler, and others.

[4] See Hofmann's interpretation of i. 11–ii. 14 in his *heil. Schr. N. T.* I. p. 60 ff., ed. 2. On the other hand, see Hilgenfeld, *Kanon u. Kritik d. N. T.* p. 190 ff.

[5] If γάρ were the correct reading (Hofmann), it would correspond to the immediately preceding contrast between ἀνθρώποις and Χριστοῦ, confirming ver. 10, but would not introduce a justification of ver. 9, as Hofmann, arbitrarily going back beyond ver. 10, assumes.

[6] Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 3.

[7] Morus, Rosenmüller, and others.

[8] Winer, p. 581 f.

[9] Comp. ὃ κηρύσσω, ii. 2.

Ver. 12. Proof of the statement, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον . . . οὐκ ἔστι κατὰ ἄνθρωπον. — οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγώ] *for neither I, i.e.*, I, as little as the other apostles. On οὐδὲ γὰρ, *for neither*, which corresponds with the positive καὶ γάρ, comp. Bornemann[5] and Hartung.[6] The earlier expositors[7] neglect both the signification of οὐδέ and the emphasis on ἐγώ, which is also overlooked by de Wette, "for also I have not," etc.; and Ewald, "I obtained it not at all."[8] Rückert, Matthies, and Schott understand οὐδέ only as if it were οὐ, assuming it to be used on account of the previous negation; and see in ἐγώ a contrast to those, *quibus ipse tradiderit evangelium*, "to whom he had delivered the gospel," in which case there must have been αὐτός instead of ἐγώ. This remark also applies to Hofmann's view, "that *he himself* has not received what he preached through human instruction." Besides, the supposed reference of ἐγώ would be quite unsuitable, for the apostle had not at all in view a comparison with his *disciples;* a comparison with the other *apostles* was the point agitating his mind. Lastly, Winer finds too much in οὐδέ, "*nam no ego quidem*," "for not even I." This is objectionable, not because, as Schott and Olshausen, following Rückert, assume, οὐδ᾽ ἐγὼ γάρ or καὶ γὰρ οὐδ᾽ ἐγώ must in that case have been written, for in fact γάρ would have its perfectly regular position (vi. 13; Rom. viii. 7; John v. 22, vii. 5, viii. 42, *et al.*); but because *ne ego quidem*, "not even I," would imply the concession of a certain *higher position* for the other apostles (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 8, 9), which would not be in harmony with the apostle's present train of thought, where his argument turned rather on his *equality* with them (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 1). [See Note XX., p. 40.] — παρὰ ἀνθρώπου] *from a man*, who had given it to me. Not to be confounded with ἀπ᾽ ἀνθρώπου.[9] Here also, as in ver. 1, we have the contrast between ἄνθρωπος and 'Ιησ. Χριστός. — αὐτό] viz. τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ. — οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην] As οὔτε refers only to the οὐκ contained in the preceding οὐδέ, and δέ and τέ do not correspond, οὔτε is here by no means inappropriate (as Rückert alleges).[1] [See Note XXI., p. 40.] *For neither have I received it from a man, nor learned it.* Παρέλαβον denotes the receiving through *communication in general* (comp. ver. 9), ἐδιδάχθην the receiving *specially* through *instruction* duly used. — ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψ. 'I. X.] The contrast to παρὰ ἀνθρώπου ; 'Ιησοῦ X. is therefore the genitive, not of the *object* (Theodoret, Matthies, Schott, Cremer), but of the *subject*,[2] *by Jesus Christ giving to me revelation.* Paul alludes to the revelations[3] received soon after the event at Damascus, and consequent therefore upon his calling, which enabled him to comply with it and to come forward as a preacher of the gospel. Comp. vv. 15, 16 ; Eph. iii. 3. The revelation referred to in 2 Cor. xii. 1 ff.[4] cannot be meant ; because this occurred at a subsequent period, when Paul had for a long time been preaching the gospel. Nor must we[5] refer it to the revelations which were imparted to him *generally*, including those of the later period, for here mention is made only of a revelation by which he *received and learned* the gospel. — *How* the ἀποκάλυψις took place[6] must be left undecided. It may have taken place with or without vision, in different stages, partly even before his baptism in the three days mentioned Acts ix. 6, 9, partly at and immediately after it, but not through instruction on the part of Ananias. The ἐν ἐμοί in ver. 16 is consistent with either supposition. [See Note XXII., p. 40.]

---

[1] **Hofmann.**

[2] Augustine, Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Calovius, Wolf, and others.

[3] Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 3.

[4] Comp. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 4. 24, τὸ τοὺς νόμους αὐτοὺς τοῖς παραβαίνουσι τὰς τιμωρίας ἔχειν βελτίονος ἢ κατ᾽ ἄνθρωπον νομοθέτου δοκεῖ μοι εἶναι, "That the laws have punishments for transgressors seems to me to prove their origin from a better lawgiver than κατ᾽ ἄνθρωπον." Eur. *Med.* 673, σοφώτερ᾽ ἢ κατ᾽ ἄνδρα συμβαλεῖν ἔπη, "to compose words wiser than κατ᾽ ἄνδρα." Soph. *Aj.* 747, "Think not κατ᾽ ἄνθρωπον." Comp. *Aj.* 764; *Oed. Col.* 604; Plat. *Pol.* 2. 359 D. The opposite, ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον εἶναι, Lucian, *Vit. auct.* 2.

[5] *ad Xen. Symp.* p. 200.

[6] *Partikell.* I. p. 211.

[7] Also Morus, Koppe, and others.

[8] Comp., on the contrary, Matt. xxi. 27; Luke xx. 8; John viii. 11.

[9] See on 1 Cor. xi. 23, and Hermann, *ad Soph. El.* 65.

Ver. 13. Now begins the *historical proof* that he was indebted for his gospel to the ἀποκάλυψις he had mentioned, and not to *human* communication and instruction. In the first place, in vv. 13, 14, he calls to their remembrance his well-known conduct while a Jew ; for, as a persecutor of the Christians and a Pharisaic zealot, he could not but be the less fitted for human instruction in the gospel, which must, on the contrary, have come to him in that superhuman mode. — *ἠκούσατε*] emphatically prefixed, indicates that what is contained in vv. 13, 14, is something already well known to his readers, which therefore required only to be recalled, not to be proved. — *τήν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφήν ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ*] *my previous course of life in Judaism*, how I formerly behaved myself as a Jew. *Ἰουδαϊσμός* is not Judaistic zeal and activity,[1] but just simply *Judaism*, as his national religious condition.[2] It forms the historical contrast to the present *Χριστιανισμός* of the apostle.[3] — *ἀναστροφή* in the sense of *course of life, behavior*, is found, in addition to the N. T. (Eph. iv. 22 ; 1 Tim. iv. 12, *et al.*) and the Apocrypha (Tob. iv. 14 ; 2 Macc. v. 8), only in later Greek, such as Polyb. iv. 82. 1.[4] — *ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδ.*] a definition of time attached to *τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφήν*, in which the repetition of *τήν* was not necessary.[5] — *ὅτι καθ᾽ ὑπερβολὴν κ.τ.λ.*] a more precise definition of the object of *ἠκούσατε*, *that I*, namely, *beyond measure persecuted*, etc. On *καθ᾽ ὑπερβολήν*, the sense of which bears a superlative relation to *σφόδρα*, comp. Rom. vii. 13 ; 1 Cor. xii. 31 ; 2 Cor. i. 8, iv. 17 ; Bernhardy, p. 241. — *τοῦ Θεοῦ*] added in the painful consciousness of the wickedness and guilt of such doings. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 9 ; 1 Tim. i. 13. — *ἐπόρθουν*] is not to be understood *de conatu*, "as conative."[6] Paul was then *actually engaged in the work of destruction* (Acts xxii. 4, comp. ix. 1, xxvi. 10, 11), and therefore it is not to be understood[7] merely as *vastavi, depopulatus sum*, "I devastated, depopulated."[8] Paul wished to be not a mere devastator, not a mere *disturber*,[9] but a *destroyer*[10] of the church ; and as such he was active.[11] Moreover, in the classic authors also *πορθεῖν* and *πέρθειν* are applied not only to things, but also to men,[12] in the sense of *bringing to ruin* and the like.[13]

---

[1] See Hand, *De part.* τέ *diss.* II. p. 13 ; Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 101 f.; Buttmann, *neutest. Gr.* p. 315. Comp. on Acts xxiii. 8.

[2] Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 1 ; Rev. i. 1.

[3] Of which, however, the book of Acts gives us no account ; for in Acts xxii. 17, Christ appeared to him not to reveal to him the gospel, but for the purpose of giving a special instruction. Hence they are not to be referred to the *event at Damascus itself*, as, following Jerome and Theodoret, many earlier and more recent expositors (Rückert, Usteri, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Hofmann, Wieseler) assume. The *calling* of the apostle, by which he was converted at Damascus, is expressly distinguished in ver. 16 from the divine ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν ἐν ἐμοί, so that this inward ἀποκάλυψις *followed* the calling ; the calling was the fact which laid the foundation for the ἀποκάλυψις (comp. Möller on de Wette)—the historical preliminary to it. In identifying the ἀποκάλυψις of our passage with the phenomenon at Damascus, it would be necessary to assume that Paul, to whom at Damascus the resurrection of Jesus was revealed, had come to add to this fundamental fact of his preaching the remaining contents of the doctrine of salvation, partly by means of argument, partly by further revelation, and partly by information derived from others (see especially Wieseler). This idea is, however, inconsistent with the assurance of our passage, which relates without restriction to the whole gospel preached by the apostle, consequently to the whole of its essential contents. The same objection may be specially urged against the view, with which Hofmann contents himself, that the wonderful phenomenon at Damascus *certified* to Paul's mind the truth of the Christian faith, which had not been unknown to him before. Such a conception of the matter falls far short of the idea of the ἀποκάλυψις of the gospel through Christ, especially as the apostle refers specifically to *his* gospel.

[4] Thomas, Cornelius à Lapide, Balduin, and others.

[5] With Koppe, Flatt, and Schott.

[6] According to Calovius, through the Holy Spirit ; comp. Acts ix. 17.

Ver. 14. Still dependent on *ὅτι*. — *καί* the *προκόπτειν ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ* had then been *combined* in Paul with his hostile action against Christianity, had *kept pace with it*. — *Ἰουδαϊσμός*, not *Jewish theology*,[14] but just as in ver. 13. *Judaism* was the sphere in which he advanced further and improved more than those of his age by growth in Jewish culture, in Jewish zeal for the law, in Jewish activity in works, etc.[15] — *συνηλικιώτης*] *one of the same age*, occurring only here in the N. T., a word belonging to the later Greek.[1] The ancient authors use *ἡλικιώτης*.[2] — *ἐν τῷ γένει μου*] a more precise definition of *συνηλικ.*; *γένει* is therefore, in conformity with the context,[3] to be understood in a *national* sense,[4] and not of the *sect of the Pharisees* (Paulus).[5] [See Note XXIII., p. 40.]— *περισσοτέρως ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων κ.τ.λ.*] a more detailed statement, specifying *in what way* the *προέκοπτον . . . γένει μου* found *active expression;* "so that I," etc. — *περισσοτέρως*] than those *πολλοί*. They, too, were zealous for the traditions of their fathers (whether like Paul they were Pharisees or not); but Paul was so *in a more superabundant measure* for his. — *τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων*] endeavoring with zealous interest to obey, uphold, and assert them.[6] The *πατρικαί μου παραδόσεις*, that is, *the religious definitions handed down to me from my fathers* (in respect to doctrine, ritual, asceticism, interpretation of Scripture, conduct of life, and the like), are the *Pharisaic* traditions;[7] for Paul was *Φαρισαῖος*, a Pharisee (Phil. iii. 5; Acts xxvi. 5), *υἱὸς Φαρισαίων*, "the son of a Pharisee" (Acts xxiii. 6).[8] If Paul had intended to refer to the *Mosaic law*, either *alone*[9] or *together with* the Pharisaic traditions,[10] he would have *named* the law either by itself or along with the traditions (Acts xxi. 20, xxii. 3; 2 Macc. iv. 2); but by *μου* he limits the *πατρικὰς παραδόσεις* to the special elements resulting from his descent, which did *not* apply to those who were in different circumstances as to descent; whereas the law applied to *all* Jews.[11] That Paul had been zealous for the *law* in general, followed as a matter of course from *προέκοπτ. ἐν τ. Ἰουδαϊσμῷ*; but here he is stating the *specific* way in which his *own peculiar* *προκόπτειν ἐν Ἰουδαϊσμῷ* had displayed itself—his *Pharisaic* zealotry. [See Note XXIV., p. 40.] It would have been surprising if in this connection he had omitted to mention the latter. — *πατρικός*, not found elsewhere in the N. T., means *paternal*.[12] In this case the context alone decides whether the idea *a patribus acceptus*, "*received from the fathers*" (*πατροπαράδοτος*, 1 Pet. i. 18) is conveyed by it, as in this passage by *μου*, or not.[13] The former is very frequently the case. As to the much-discussed varying distinction between *πάτριος*, *πατρικός*, and *πατρῷος*, comp. on Acts xxii. 3.

---

[1] Matthies, "when I was still *out and out* a Jew ;" comp. Schott.

[2] See 2 Macc. ii. 21, viii. 1, xiv. 38 ; 4 Macc. iv. 26.

[3] Comp. Ignat. *ad Magnes*. 8, 10, *Philad*. 6.

[4] See Wetstein.

[5] Comp. Plat. *Legg*. iii. p. 685 D, ἡ τῆς Τροίας ἅλωσις τὸ δεύτερον. Soph. *O. R.* 1043, τοῦ τυράννου τῆς δε γῆς πάλαι ποτέ. Phil. i. 26. Comp. also on 1 Cor. viii. 7 and on 2 Cor. xi. 23.

[6] Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Menochius, and others.

[7] With Beza, Piscator, Estius, Winer, Usteri, and Schott.

[8] Hom. *Od*. xiv. 264, ἀγροὺς πόρθεον, *et al.*

[9] See Luther's translation.

[10] Nicht bloss *Ver*störer, sondern *Zer*störer.

[11] Hom. *Il*. iv. 308, πόλιας καὶ τείχε᾽ ἐπόρθουν, "were laying waste cities and walls," *et al.*

[12] Comp. Acts ix. 21.

[13] See Heindorf, *ad Plat. Prot.* p. 340 A ; Lobeck, *ad Soph. Aj.* 1187 ; Jacobs, *Del. epigr.* i. 80.

[14] Grotius, Rückert.

[15] On προκόπτειν as intransitive (Luke ii. 52 ; 2 Tim. ii. 16, iii. 9, 13), very frequent in Polyb., Lucian, etc., comp. Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* X. p. 35 ; on ἐν τ Ἰουδ., comp. Lucian, *Herm.* 63, ἐν τοῖς μαθήμασι, *Paras.* 13, ἐν ταῖς τέχναις.

Ver. 15. *But when it pleased*, etc.[14] This denotes, of course, the free *placuit* of the divine decree, but is here conceived as an act in time, which is immediately followed by its execution, not as from eternity.[1] — ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου] *who separated me*, that is, in His counsel set me apart from other men for a special destination, *from my mother's womb*; that is, not *in* the womb;[2] nor, from the time when I was in the womb;[3] nor, *before* I was born;[4] but, as soon as I had issued from the womb, *from my birth*.[5] ἐκ γενετῆς, John ix. 1, has the same meaning. Comp. the Greek ἐκ γαστρός, and the like. We must not assume a reference to Jer. i. 5,[6] for in that passage there is an essentially different definition of *time* (πρὸ τοῦ με πλάσαι σε ἐν κοιλίᾳ κ.τ.λ.). We may add, that this designation of God completely corresponds with Paul's representation of his apostolic *independence of men*. *What it was*, to which God had *separated* him from his birth and had *called* him (at Damascus), is of course evident in itself and from i. 1; but it also results from the sequel (ver. 16). It was the *apostleship*, which he recognized as a special proof of free and undeserved divine grace;[7] hence here also he adds διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ.[8] Rückert is wrong in asserting that καλέσας cannot refer here to the call at Damascus, but can only denote the calling to salvation and the apostleship *in the Divine mind*. In favor of this view he adduces the *aorist*, which represents the κλῆσις as *previous* to the εὐδόκησεν ἀποκαλύψαι, and also the connection of καλέσας with ἀφορίσας by means of καί. Both arguments are based upon the erroneous idea that the revelation of the gospel was coincident with the calling of the apostle. But Paul was first *called* at Damascus by the miraculous appearance of Christ, which laid hold of him without any detailed instruction (Phil. iii. 12), and thereafter, through the apocalyptic operation of God, *the Son of God was revealed in him*: the κλῆσις at Damascus preceded this ἀποκάλυψις;[9] the former called him to the service, the latter furnished him with the contents, of the gospel. Comp. on ver. 12. Moreover, the κλῆσις is never an act in the Divine mind, but always an historical fact (Rom. viii. 30). This also militates against Hofmann, who makes ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου belong to καλέσας as well—a connection excluded by the very position of the words. And what a strange definition of the idea conveyed by καλεῖν, and how completely foreign to the N. T., is the view of Hofmann, who makes it designate "an act executed *in the course of the formation of this man*"! Moreover, our passage undoubtedly implies that by the calling and revelation here spoken of the consciousness of apostleship—and that too of apostleship to the heathen—was divinely produced in Paul, and became clear and certain. This, however, does not exclude, but is, on the contrary, a divine preparation for, the fuller development of this consciousness in its more definite aspects by means of experience and the further guidance of Christ and His Spirit.

---

[1] Diod. Sic. i. 53? *Alciphr.* i. 12. See Wetstein.

[2] Plat. *Apol.* p. 33 C, and frequently.

[3] Comp. *ἐν τῷ Ἰουδ.*

[4] For with *Hellenist* associates, of whom likewise in Jerusalem there could be no lack, he does not desire to compare himself.

[5] Comp. Phil. iii. 5; 2 Cor. xi. 26; Rom. ix. 3; Acts vii. 19.

[6] On the genitive of the *object*, comp. 2 Macc. iv. 2; Acts xxi. 20, xxii. 3; 1 Cor. xiv. 12; Tit. ii. 14; Plat. *Prot.* p. 343 A.

[7] Comp. Matt. v. 21, xv. 2; Mark vii. 3.

[8] So also Erasmus (*Annot.*), Beza, Calovius, de Wette, Hofmann, and others.

[9] Erasmus, *Paraphr.*, Luther, Calvin, and others.

[10] Estius, Grotius, Calixtus, Morus, Koppe, Flatt, Winer, Usteri, Rückert, Schott, Olshausen, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, "the law according to the strict rule of Pharisaism," comp. Möller.

[11] Comp., as parallel, Acts xxvi. 5.

[12] Comp. LXX. Gen. l. 8; Lev. xxii. 13; Ecclus. xlii. 10; 3 Esd. i. 5, 31; 4 Macc. xviii. 7; Plat. *Lach.* p. 180 E, *Soph.* p. 242 A; Isocr. *Evang.* p. 218, 35; Diod. Sic. i. 88; Polyb. i. 78. 1; Athen. xv. p. 667 F.

[13] As, for instance, Polyb. xxi. 5, 7.

[14] Comp. Luke xii. 32; 1 Cor. i. 21; Rom. xv. 26; Col. i. 19; 1 Thess. ii. 8, iii. 1.

---

[1] Beza.

[2] Wieseler.

[3] Hofmann, comp. Möller.

[4] Rückert.

[5] Comp. Ps. xxii. 10; Isa. xliv. 2, xlix. 1, 5; Matt. xix. 12; Acts iii. 2, xiv. 8 (in Luke i. 15, where ἔτι is added, the thought is different).

[6] Grotius, Semler, Reithmayr, and others.

[7] Rom. i. 4, xii. 3, xv. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 10.

[8] For διὰ τ. χάρ. αὐτοῦ belongs to καλέσας as a modal definition of it, and not to ἀποκαλύψαι, as Hofmann, disregarding the symmetrically similar construction of the two participial statements, groundlessly asserts. Paul knew himself to be κλητὸς ἀπόστολος διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1), and he knew that this θέλημα was that of the divine *grace*, 1 Cor. xv. 10, iii. 10; Gal. ii. 9; Rom. i. 5, xii. 3.

[9] Hence also ἐν ἐμοί by no means diminishes the importance of the external phenomenon at Damascus (as Baur and others contend).

Ver. 16. Ἀποκαλύψαι] belongs to εὐδόκησεν; but ἐν ἐμοί is *in my mind*, in my consciousness, in which the Son of God was to become manifest as the sum and substance of knowledge (Phil. iii. 8); comp. 2 Cor. iv. 6, ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, "in our hearts."[1] But ἐν is never *nota dativi*, "a mark of the dative," and all the passages adduced to that effect (such as 1 Cor. ix. 15, xiv. 11; 1 Tim. iv. 15; Acts iv. 12, *et al.*) are to be so explained that ἐν shall retain its signification;[2] as must also be the case in the passages used to support the sense of the *dativus commodi*, "dative of advantage."[3] Jerome, Pelagius, Erasmus, Piscator, Vorstius, Grotius, Estius, Morus, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others, interpret it *through me*, "ut per me, velut organum, notum redderet filium suum," "that through me, as an organ, He might make His Son known."[4] But the revelation given *to the apostle himself* is a necessary element in the connection (ver. 12): Paul was immediately after his birth *set apart* by God, subsequently *called* at Damascus, and afterward provided inwardly with the *revelation of the Son of God*, in order that he might be able outwardly to *preach*, etc. Others, again,[5] take it as "*on me*," *in my case*, which is explained to mean either that the conversion appeared as a proof of Christ's power, etc.,[6] or that the revelation had been imparted to the apostle as matter of fact, by means of his own experience, or, in other words, through his own case (Rückert).[7] But the former explanation is unsuitable to the context, and the latter again depends on the erroneous identification of the calling of the apostle at Damascus with the revelation of the gospel which he received. — τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ] This is the great foundation and whole sum of the gospel. Comp. ver. 6 f., ii. 20. In his pre-Christian blindness Paul had known Christ κατὰ σάρκα, 2 Cor. v. 16. — εὐαγγελίζωμαι] *Present tense*;[8] for the fulfilment of this destination which had even *then* been assigned to him by God[9] was, at the time when the epistle was written, still *in course of execution*.[10] Thus, in opposition to his adversaries, the continuous divine right and obligation of this apostolic action is asserted. — ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] *among the heathen peoples*.[11] The fact that Paul always began his work of conversion with the *Jews* resident among the Gentiles, was not inconsistent with his destination as the *apostle of the Gentiles ;* this, indeed, was the *way* of calling adopted by the Gentile apostle in accordance with that destination (see Rom. i. 16).[1] — εὐθέως] does not belong exclusively either to the *negative*[2] or to the *affirmative* part of the apodosis ;[3] but as the two parts themselves are inseparably associated, it belongs to the whole sentence οὐ προσανεθέμην . . . ἀλλὰ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀραβ., "Immediately I took not counsel with flesh and blood, nor did I make a journey to Jerusalem, but," etc. He expresses that which he had done *immediately* after he had received the revelation, *by way of antithesis*, negatively and positively ; for it was his object most assiduously to dispel the notion that he had received human instruction. Jerome, in order to defend the apostle against Porphyry's unjust reproach of presumption and fickleness, connects εὐθέως with εὐαγγελίζωμαι ; as recently Credner[4] has also done. No objection can be taken to the emphasis of the adverb at the end of the sentence ;[5] but the whole strength of the proof lies not in what Paul *was* immediately *to do*, but in what he *had* immediately done.[6] We must, moreover, allow εὐθέως to retain its usual strict signification, and not, with Hofmann,[7] substitute the sense of "immediately *then*," "just at once" ("*not at a subsequent time only*"), as if Paul had written ἤδη ἐκ τότε or the like. Observe, too, on comparing the book of Acts, that the purposely added εὐθέως still does not exclude a brief ministry in Damascus previous to the journey to Arabia (Acts ix. 20), the more especially as his main object was to show that he had gone from Damascus to no other place than Arabia, and had not until three years later gone to Jerusalem. To make special mention of his brief working in Damascus, before his departure to Arabia, was foreign to the logical scope of his statement. — οὐ προσανεθέμην] *I addressed no communication to flesh and blood*, namely, in order to learn the opinion of others as to this revelation which I had received, and to obtain from them instruction, guidance, and advice. πρός conveys the notion of *direction*, and not, as Beza and Bengel assert,[8] the idea *praeterea*, "*besides*,"[9] — σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι] that is, *to weak men*, in contrast to the experience of *God's* working.[1] Eph. vi. 12 is also analogous.[2] As the apostle was concerned simply to show that he was not ἀνθρωποδίδακτος, "taught of man," it is *wholly* unsuitable in this connection to refer σαρκὶ κ. αἵμ. to *himself*,[3] and unsuitable, as regards *half* the reference, to apply it to others *and* the apostle himself.[4] He is speaking simply of the consultation *of others*,[5] and that *quite generally:* "having received this *divine* revelation, I did not take weak *men* as my counsellors." In the continuation of the discourse towards its climax the apostles are specially brought into prominence as members of this category, and therefore σαρκὶ κ. αἵμ. is not[6] at once to be referred to the *apostles* themselves, although they also are included in it.

---

[1] See Chrysostom, τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως καταλαμπούσης αὐτοῦ τὴν ψυχήν, "His revelation enlightening the soul." Comp. Oecum. (εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον τῆς γνώσεως ἐνιζησάσης), Theophylact, Beza, and most expositors. Calvin, Koppe, Flatt, and others, wrongly hold that it stands for the mere dative. Comp. Bengel.

[2] Winer, p. 204.

[3] See Bernhardy, p. 212.

[4] Erasmus, *Paraphr.*

[5] Comp. Hilgenfeld *in loc.* and in his *Zeitschr.* 1864, p. 164: Paul regarded his Christian and apostolic *life and working* as a revelation of Christ *in his person*. Similar is the view taken by Paul in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1863, p. 208.

[6] Peter Lombard, Seb. Schmidt.

[7] Comp. 1 John iv. 9, ἐφανερώθη ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν.

[8] Which, according to Hofmann, is intended to designate the purpose from the standpoint of *the present time* in which it is being realized. This retrospective interpretation is purely imaginary, by no means suits even Plat *Legg.* p. 653 D, and in our passage is opposed to the context (see ver. 17).

[9] Acts ix. 15, xxii. 15, xxvi. 17 f.

[10] Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 618.

[11] See Acts ix. 15, xxii. 21, xxvi. 17, 18; Eph. iii. 8; Rom. xi. 13.

---

[1] Comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 37.

[2] Hilgenfeld, Hofmann.

[3] Winer.

[4] *Einl.* I. 1, p. 303.

[5] Kühner, II. p. 625 ; Bornemann, *ad Xen. Anab.* ii. 6. 9 ; Stallbaum, *ad Phaedr.* p. 256 E.

[6] "Notatur subita habilitas apostoli," "the sudden fitness of the apostle is denoted," Bengel.

[7] Who invents the hypothesis, that the apostle had been reproached with having *only subsequently* taken up the ground that he did not apply to men in order to get advice from them. Hofmann strangely appeals to εὐθύς, John xiii. 32, and even to Xen. *Cyr.* i. 6. 20, where the idea, "not at a subsequent time only," is indeed conveyed by ἐκ παιδίου, "from a child," but not at all by εὐθύς in itself. Even in passages such as those in Dorvill. *ad Charit.* pp. 298, 326, εὐθύς, like εὐθέως constantly, means *immediately, on the spot.*

[8] Comp. also Usteri and Jatho.

[9] So, too, Märcker in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 534, "no *further* communication." It is not, however, apparent to what *other* ἀνατίθεσθαι this is conceived to refer. See Diod. Sic. xvii. 116, τοῖς μάντεσι προσαναθέμενος περὶ τοῦ σημείου, "Having conferred with the diviners concerning the sign," Lucian, *Jup. Trag.* 1, ἐμοὶ προσανάθου, λάβε με σύμβουλον πόνων, "confer with me ; make me an adviser of your tasks," in contrast to the preceding καταμόνας σαυτῷ λαλεῖς, "you speak apart, by yourself," Nicetas, *Angel. Comnen.* ii. 5. Comp. C. F. A. Fritzsche in *Fritzschior. Opusc.* p. 204. Just so προσαναφέρειν, 2 Macc. xi. 36 ; Tob. xii. 15 ; Polyb. xxxi. 19. 4, xvii. 9. 10.

Ver. 17. *Neither went I away* (from Damascus) *to Jerusalem, unto those who were apostles before me; but I went away into Arabia.* So according to Lachmann's reading; see the critical notes. Τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστ. is written by Paul in the consciousness of his *full equality of apostolic rank* (beginning from Damascus), in which no precedence, save that of *seniority*, pertained to the older apostles.[7] — εἰς Ἀραβίαν] It is possible that some special *personal* reason, *unknown* to us, induced him to choose this particular country. The region was heathen, containing, however, many Jews of the Diaspora (Acts ii. 11). [See Note XXV., p. 40 seq.] This journey, which is to be looked upon not as having for its object a quiet preparation,[8] but as a first, certainly fervent experiment of extraneous ministry,[9] and which was of short duration,[10] is not mentioned in Acts. Perhaps not known to Luke at all, it is most probably to be placed in the period of the ἱκαναὶ ἡμέραι, Acts ix. 23,—an inexact statement of the interval between the conversion and the journey to Jerusalem, which betrays, on the part of Luke, only a vague and inadequate knowledge of the chronology of this period.[1] Paul mentions the journey here, because he had to show—following the continuous thread of the history—that, in the first period after his conversion, he had not been anywhere where he could have received instruction from the apostles.—πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα] πάλιν, used on the hypothesis that the locality of the calling and revelation mentioned was well known to his readers, refers to the notion of *coming* conveyed in ὑπέστρ.[2]

---

[1] See on Matt. xvi. 17.

[2] Comp. the rabbinical בָּשָׂר וָדָם, "flesh and blood," (Lightfoot, on Matt. *l.c.*)

[3] Koppe, Ewald.

[4] Winer, Matthies, Schott, comp. Olshausen.

[5] Beza, Grotius, Calovius, Zachariae, Morus, Rosenmüller, Borger, Flatt, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann, Eadie, and others.

[6] With Chrysostom, Jerome, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and others.

[7] On the twice-employed emphatic ἀπῆλθον, comp. Rom. viii. 15; Heb. xii. 18 ff.; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 137.

[8] Schrader, Köhler, Rückert, Schott.

[9] Our passage bears testimony in favor of this view by εὐθέως . . . ἀπῆλθον following immediately on ἵνα εὐαγγ. αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. Hence Holsten's view (*die Bedeutung des Wortes* σάρξ *im N. T.* p. 25; *ueber Inh. u. Gedankeng. d. Gal. Br.* p. 17 f.; also *zum Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 269 f.), that Paul, "purposely tearing himself away for three years from the atmosphere of the national spirit at Jerusalem," had gone to Arabia, "*in order to reconcile the new revelation with the old by meditating on the religious records of his people*," is quite opposed to the context. Certainly the system of the apostle's gospel, as it is exhibited in the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans, must have taken its shape gradually, and by means of a long process of thought amidst the widening of experience; but even in the absence of such a developed system he might make a commencement of his ministry, and might preach the Son of God as the latter had been directly revealed in him by divine agency. Thiersch arbitrarily considers (*Kirche in apostol. Zeitalt.* p. 116) that *he desired to find protection with Aretas.* It is the view also of Acts, that Paul immediately after his conversion followed the divine guidance, and did not postpone his beginning to preach till the expiration of three years. According to Acts, he preached immediately, even in Damascus, ix. 20; comp. xxvi. 19 f. See, besides, on Rom. *Introd.* § 1.

[10] L. Cappellus, Benson, Witsius, Eichhorn, Hemsen, and others, also Anger, *Rat. temp.* p. 122, and Laurent, hold the opinion that Paul spent almost the whole three years (ver. 18) in Arabia, because the Jews at Damascus would not have tolerated his remaining there so long. But in our ignorance of the precise state of things in Damascus, this argument is of too uncertain a character, especially as Acts ix. 22, comp. with ver. 23, ὡς δὲ ἐπληρ. ἡμέραι ἱκαναί,

Ver. 18. Ἔπειτα] *After that*, namely, after my second sojourn in Damascus—whence he escaped, as is related Acts ix. 24 f.; 2 Cor. xi. 32 f. The more *precise* statement of time then follows in the words μετὰ ἔτη τρία (comp. ii. 1), in which the *terminus a quo* is taken to be *either* his *conversion*[3] or his *return from Arabia*.[4] The former is to be preferred, as is suggested by the context in οὐδὲ ἀπῆλϑον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα . . . μετὰ ἔτη τρία ἀνῆλϑον εἰς Ἱεροσολ. Comp. also on ii. 1. — ἀνῆλϑον εἰς Ἱεροσ.] This is (contrary to Jerome's view) the *first* journey to Jerusalem, not omitted in the Acts,[5] but mentioned in ix. 26. The quite untenable arguments of Köhler[6] against this identity are refuted by Anger.[7] It must, however, be conceded that the account in Acts must receive a partial *correction* from our passage[8] [see Note XXVI., p. 41]; a necessity, however, which is exaggerated by Baur, Hilgenfeld, and Zeller, and is attributed to intentional alteration of the history on the part of the author of Acts, it being supposed that the latter was *unwilling* to do the very thing which Paul in our passage wishes, namely, to bring out his independence of the original apostles. But this consciousness of independence is not to be exaggerated, as if Paul had felt himself "alien in the very centre of his being" from Peter.[9] — ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν] *in order to make the personal acquaintance of Cephas;* not, therefore, in order to obtain

---

"when many days were fulfilled," points to a relatively longer working in Damascus. And if Paul had labored almost three years, or, according to Ewald, about two years, in Arabia, and that at the very beginning of his apostleship, we could hardly imagine that Luke should not have known of this ministry in Arabia, or, if he knew of it, that he should not have mentioned it, for Paul never stayed so long anywhere else, except perhaps at Ephesus. It may indeed be alleged that Luke *purposely* kept silence as to the journey to Arabia, because it would have proved the independent action of the apostle to the Gentiles (Hilgenfeld, Zeller); but this view sets out from the premise that the book of Acts is a partisan treatise, wanting in historical honesty; and it moreover assumes—what without that premise is not to be assumed—that the author was acquainted with our epistle. If he was acquainted with it, the intentional distortion of portions of his history, which it is alleged he allowed himself to make, would be the more shameless, and indeed foolish.

[1] See on Acts ix. 19 ff.

[2] Comp. Acts xviii. 21; Hom. *Od.* viii. 301, αὖτις ὑποστρέψας, "having turned him back again," *et al.;* Eur. *Alc.* 1022; Bornemann, *ad Cyrop.* iii. 3. 60; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 2. 4.

[3] As by most expositors, including Winer, Fritzsche, Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, Baumgarten Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, Caspari.

[4] Marsh, Koppe, Borger.

[5] Laurent.

[6] *Abfassungszeit*, p. 1 f.

[7] *Rat. temp.* p. 124 f.

[8] See on Acts ix. 26 f.

[9] Holsten.

instruction. But the position of Peter as coryphaeus[1] in the apostolic circle, especially urged by the Catholics,[2] appears at all events from this passage to have been then known to Paul and acknowledged by him. Ἱστορεῖν, *coram cognoscere*, "to know personally," which does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., is found in this sense applied to a person also in Joseph. *Bell.* vi. 1. 8, οὐκ ἄσημος ὢν ἀνὴρ, ὃν ἐγὼ κατ' ἐκεῖνον ἱστόρησα τὸν πόλεμον, "being not an unknown man, whom I in that war knew personally," *Antt.* i. 11. 4, viii. 2. 5 ; frequently also in the *Clementines.* It is often used by Greek authors[3] in reference to things, as τὴν πόλιν, τὴν χώραν, τὴν νόσον κ.τ.λ.[4] Bengel, moreover, well says : "grave verbum ut de re magna ; non dixit ἰδεῖν (as in John xii. 21) sed ἱστορῆσαι," "an important word for a great subject ; he did not say ἰδεῖν, but ἱστορῆσαι."[5] — καὶ ἐπέμεινα πρὸς αὐτόν[6]] πρός, *with*, conveys the direction of the *intercourse* implied in ἐπέμ.[7] — ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε] For the *historical* cause why he did not remain longer, see Acts ix. 29, xxii. 17 ff. The *intention*, however, which induced Paul to *specify* the time, is manifest from the whole connection,—that the reader might judge for himself whether so short a sojourn, the object of which was to become personally acquainted for the first time with Peter, could have been also intended for the further object of receiving evangelic instruction, especially when Paul had himself been preaching the gospel already so long (for three years). This intention is denied by Rückert, because the period of fifteen days was not so short but that during it Paul might have been instructed by Peter. But Paul is giving an *historical* account ; and in doing this the mention of a time *so short* could not but be welcome to him for his purpose, without his wishing to give it forth as a *stringent* proof. This, notwithstanding what Paul emphatically adds in ver. 19, it certainly was not, as is evident even from the high representative repute of Peter.[8] [See Note XXVII., p. 41.] But the briefer his stay at that time, devoted to making the personal acquaintance of Peter, had been, the more it told against the notion of his having received instruction, although Paul naturally could not, and would not, *represent* this time as shorter than it *had really been*. Rückert's arbitrary conjecture is therefore quite superfluous, that Paul mentions the fifteen days on account of the false allegation of his opponents that he had been first brought to Christianity by the apostles, or had, at any rate, spent a long time with them and as their disciple, but that he sought ungratefully and arrogantly either to conceal or deny these facts. According to Holsten, Peter and James were the representatives of the ἕτερον εὐαγγ., who in consequence could not have exerted any influence on Paul's Gentile gospel. But this they were not at all. See on ii. 1 ff. and on Acts xv.

---

[1] Theodoret.

[2] See Windischmann andReithmayr.

[3] Comp. also the passages from Josephus in Krebs, *Obss.* p. 318.

[4] See Wetstein and Kypke.

[5] Comp. Chrysostom.

[6] Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 7.

[7] Comp. Matt. xxvi. 55 ; John i. 1 ; and the passages in Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 202. Comp. Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 653.

[8] Hofmann is of opinion that Paul desired his readers to understand that he could not have journeyed to Jerusalem in order to ask the opinion and advice of the "*apostolic body*" there. As if Peter and James could not have been "*apostolic body*" enough ! Taking refuge in this way behind the distinction between *apostles* and the *apostolic body* was foreign to Paul.

Ver. 19. *But another of the apostles saw I not, save James the brother of the Lord.* Thus this James is distinguished indeed from the circle of the twelve (1 Cor. xv. 5) to which Peter belonged, but yet is included in the number of the apostles, namely in the wider sense (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 5, xv. 7) ; which explains the merely supplementary mention of *this* apostle.[1] — *ἕτερον* is not qualitative here, as in ver. 6, but stands in contrast to the *one* who is named, Peter. In addition to the latter he saw not one more of the apostles, except only that he saw the apostle in the wider sense of the term—James the brother of the Lord (who indeed belonged to the church at Jerusalem as its president),—a fact which conscientiously he will not leave unmentioned.—On the point that *James the brother of the Lord* was *not* James the son of Alphaeus,—as, following Clemens Alex., Jerome, Augustine, Pelagius, Chrysostom, and Theodoret, most modern scholars, and among the expositors of the epistle Matthies, Usteri, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, Jatho, Hofmann, Reithmayr, maintain,—but a *real brother of Jesus* (Matt. xiii. 35 ; Mark vi. 3), the son of Mary, called James the Just,[2] who, having been a Nazarite from his birth, and having become a believer after the resurrection of Jesus (1 Cor. xv. 7 ; Acts i. 14), attained to very high apostolic reputation among the Jewish Christians (ii. 9), and was the most influential presbyter of the church at Jerusalem,[3] see on Acts xii. 17 ; 1 Cor. ix. 5 ; Huther *on Ep. of James*, Introd. § 1 ; Laurent, *Neutest. Stud.* p. 175 ff.[4] By the more precise designation, *τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου*, he is *distinguished* not only from the elder James, the brother of John,[5] but also from James the son of Alphaeus, who was one of the twelve.[6] The whole figment of the identity of this James with the son of Alphaeus is a result of the unscriptural (Matt. i. 25 ; Luke ii. 7) although ecclesiastically orthodox[7] belief (extending beyond the birth of Christ) in the perpetual virginity of Mary.[8] [See Note XXVIII., p. 41.] We may add that the statement, that Paul at this time saw only Peter and James at Jerusalem, is not at variance with the inexact expression *τοὺς ἀποστόλους*, Acts ix. 27, but is an authentic historical definition of it, of a more precise character. [See Note XXIX., p. 41.]

---

[1] After *εἰ μή* we must supply not *εἶδον* merely (as Grotius, Fritzsche *ad Matth.* p. 482, Winer, Bleek in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, p. 1059, Wieseler), but, as the context requires, *εἶδον τὸν ἀπόστολον.*

[2] Heges. in *Eus.* ii. 23.

[3] Wieseler also justly recognizes here the actual brother of Jesus, but holds *the* James, who is named in ii. 9, 12 (and Acts xii. 17, xv. 13, 21 ; 1 Cor. xv. 7) as the head of the Jewish Christians, not to be identical with this brother of the Lord, but to be the apostle *James the son of Alphaeus ;* affirming that it was the latter also who was called *ὁ δίκαιος*, "the just." See, however, on ii. 9. The Gospel of the Hebrews, in Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 2, puts James the Just among the apostles who partook of the last Supper with Jesus, but nevertheless represents him as a *brother* of the Lord, for it makes him to be addressed by the Risen One as "*frater mi*," "my brother." Wieseler, indeed, understands *frater mi*, "my brother," in a spiritual sense, as in John xx. 17, Matt. xxviii. 10. But, just because the designation of a James as *ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου*, "the Lord's brother" is so solemn, this interpretation appears arbitrary ; nor do we find that anywhere in the Gospels Jesus *addressed* the disciples as brethren.

[4] [Also, Sieffert, article *James*, Herzog's Real-Encycl., 2d ed., vol. vi.]

[5] Hofmann and others.

[6] Comp. Victorinus, " cum autem *fratrem* dixit, *apostolum negavit*," " but when he said '*brother*,' he denied '*apostle*.' "

[7] *Form. Conc.* p. 767.

[8] Comp. on Matt. xii. 46 ; 1 Cor. ix. 5.

Ver. 20. Not a parenthesis, but, at the conclusion of what Paul has just related of that first sojourn of his at Jerusalem after his conversion (namely, that he had travelled thither to make the acquaintance of Cephas, had remained with him fifteen days, and had seen none of the other apostles besides, only James the brother of the Lord), an affirmation by oath that in this he had spoken the pure truth. The *importance* of the facts he had just related for his object—to prove his apostolic independence—induced him to make this sacred assurance. For if Paul had ever been a disciple of the apostles, he must have become so *then*, when he was with the apostles at Jerusalem for the first time after his conversion; but not only had he been there with another object in view, and for so few days, but, besides Peter, he had met with James only. The reference to all that had been said from ver. 12,[1] or at least to vv. 15–19,[2] is precluded by the fact that ἔπειτα in ver. 18 begins a fresh section of the report (comp. ver. 21, ii. 1), beyond which there is no reason to go back. —The sentence is so *constructed* that ἃ δὲ γράφω ὑμῖν stands emphatically by itself as an anacoluthon; and before ὅτι, *that*, we have again to supply γράφω, *But what I write to you—behold in the sight of God I write, that I lie not;* that is, in respect to what I write to you, I write, I assure you before the face of God,[3] that I lie not.[4] Schott takes ὅτι as *since*, "*coram Deo scribo, siquidem non mentior,*" "in the sight of God I write, since I lie not," whereby ἃ δὲ γρ. ὑμ. does not appear as an anacoluthon. But this *siquidem non mentior*, "*since I lie not,*" would be very flat; whereas the anacoluthon of the prefixed relative sentence is precisely in keeping with the fervency of the language.[5] The completely parallel protestation also, ὁ Θεὸς . . . οἶδεν . . . ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι,[6] is quite unfavorable to the explanation of ὅτι as *siquidem*. To supply with Bengel, Paulus, and Rückert (comp. Jerome), an ἐστί after Θεοῦ (ὅτι, *that*), does not make the construction easier;[7] on the contrary, it is arbitrary, and yields an unprecedented mode of expression.

Ver. 21. After this stay of fifteen days in Jerusalem (ἔπειτα, comp. ver. 18), I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia; and consequently was again far enough away from the seat of the apostles! — τῆς Συρίας] As it is said in Acts ix. 30 that Paul was accompanied from Jerusalem to Caesarea, it is assumed by most modern expositors: "*Syriae* eam partem dicit, cui *Phoenices* nomen fuit," "He is speaking of that part of Syria which had the name of Phoenicia," Winer.[8] This view runs entirely counter to the design of the apostle. For here his main concern was to bring out his comparatively *wide separation* from Judaea, as it had occurred in his actual history; the whole context (comp. ver. 22) shows that it was so, and therefore the reader could only understand τῆς Συρίας as meaning *Syria proper* (with

---

[1] Calvin, Koppe, Winer, Matthies.

[2] Hofmann.

[3] לִפְנֵי יְהוָֹה, so that I have God present as witness.

[4] Comp. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 338.

[5] Comp. Matt. x. 14; Luke xxi. 6, and the note thereon.

[6] 2 Cor. xi. 31; comp. Rom. i. 9; 2 Cor. i. 33.

[7] Rückert.

[8] So also Koppe, Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Schott. Comp. Matt. iv. 24; Acts xxi. 3.

Antioch as its capital). It could not in the least occur to him to think of *Phoenicia*,[1] the more especially as alongside of τῆς Συρίας Cilicia, which borders on Syria proper, is immediately named (comp. Acts xv. 23, 41; Plin. v. 22, xviii. 30). An appeal is also wrongly made to Matt. iv. 24[2] and Acts xxi. 3.[3] The relation of our passage to Acts ix. 30 is this: On leaving Jerusalem, Paul desired to visit Syria and Cilicia; he was accordingly conducted by the Christians as far as the first stage, Caesarea,[4] and thence he went on by land to Syria and Cilicia. Comp. on Acts ix. 30.—*For what object* he visited Syria and Cilicia, he does not state; but for this very reason, and in accordance with ver. 5, it cannot be doubted that he preached the gospel there. *Tarsus* was certainly the central point of this ministry; it was at Tarsus that Barnabas sought and found him (Acts xi. 25).

Ver. 22. But I was so completely a stranger to the land of Judaea, that at the time of my sojourn in Syria and Cilicia I was personally unknown to the churches, etc. These statements (vv. 22–24) likewise go to prove that Paul had not been a disciple of *the apostles*, which is indeed the object aimed at in the whole of the context. As a pupil of the *apostles*, he would have remained in communication with *Jerusalem;* and proceeding thence, he would first of all have exercised his ministry in the churches *of Judaea*, and have become well known to them.[5] Others, inconsistently with the context, suppose that Paul desired to refute the allegation that he had been *a learner* from the churches of Judaea,[6] or that he himself had *taught* judaistically in Judaea,[7] or that he had visited Syria and Cilicia as the deputy of the churches of Judaea.[8] — τῷ προσώπῳ] *as regards the* (my) *countenance*, that is, *personally*.

---

[1] Which even Wieseler, though not understanding it alone to be referred to, includes.

[2] Where, in the language of hyperbole, a very *large district*—namely, the whole *province* of Syria, of which Judaea and Samaria formed portions—is meant to be designated.

[3] Where likewise the Roman province is intended, and that only loosely and indefinitely with reference to the coast district. For any one sailing from Patara and passing in front of Cyprus to the right has the Syrian coast before him towards the east, and is sailing towards it. Thus indefinitely, as was suggested by the popular view and report, Luke relates, Acts xxi. 3, ἐπλέομεν εἰς Συρίαν, "we sailed into Syria," without meaning by the καὶ κατήχθημεν εἰς Τύρον, "and landed at Tyre," that follows to make this Συρίαν, "Syria," equivalent to Phoenicia. For instance, a man might say, "We sailed towards Denmark and landed at Glückstadt," without intending it to be inferred that Denmark is equivalent to Holstein.

[4] The Roman capital of Judaea, not Caesarea Philippi.

[5] According to Hofmann, the end at which Paul aims in ver. 22 f. is conveyed by καὶ ἐδόξαζον κ.τ.λ. in ver. 24, so that vv. 22, 23 are only related to this as the protasis to the apodosis. This idea is at variance with the independent and important nature of the two affirmations in vv. 22, 23; if Paul had intended to give them so subordinate a position as that which Hofmann supposes, he would have done it by a participial construction (ἀγνοοῦντες δὲ . . . μόνον δὲ ἀκούοντες, ὅτι κ.τ.λ., ἐδόξαζον κ.τ.λ.), perhaps also with the addition of καίπερ, or in some other marked way. In the form in which the apostle has written it, his report introduced by ἔπειτα in ver. 21 is composed of propositions quite as independent as those following ἔπειτα in ver. 18, and vv. 22, 23 cannot be intended merely to introduce ver. 24. Hofmann is therefore the more incorrect in asserting that Paul, from ver. 21 onwards, is not continuing the proof of his apostolic independence in contradistinction to the other apostles, but is exhibiting the *harmony of his preaching with the faith of the mother-church at Jerusalem and its apostles.*

[6] Oecumenius, Gomarus, Olshausen.

[7] Chrysostom, Theophylact, Grotius; comp. Usteri.

[8] Michaelis.

Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 17. — *ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς 'Ιουδ.*] This is meant to refer to the churches *out of* Jerusalem, consequently in the *'Ιουδαία γῆ*, John iii. 22. For that he was known to the chruch in the *capital* is not only a matter of inference from his pre-Christian activity, but is certain from that fifteen days' visit (ver. 18), and is attested by Acts ix. 26–30.[1]

Vv. 23, 24. Δέ] places *μόνον ἀκούοντες ἦσαν* in *correlation* to *ἤμην ἀγνοούμενος τῷ προσώπῳ*; it is not, however, to be understood as a mere repetition of the former *δέ* (Hofmann), for it introduces another[2] subject.[3] The *masculine* refers to the *persons* of whom those *ἐκκλησίαι* consisted.[4] The participle *with ἦσαν*, however, does not stand for the simple imperfect (Luther renders quite incorrectly, "they *had* heard"), but prominence is given to the predicate as the main point.[5] The clause expresses the sole relation in which they *were* to Paul; they were simply in a position to *hear*.[6] — *ὅτι ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτε κ.τ.λ.*] *ὅτι* is explained most simply, not by a supposed transition from the indirect to the direct form,[7] but as the *recitativum*,[8] the use of which by Paul is certain not merely in quotations of Scripture, but also in other cases (Rom. iii. 8; 2 Thess. iii. 10). Moreover, the statement thus gains in vividness. In *ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς*, *ἡμᾶς* applies to the *Christians generally*; the joyful information came to them from *Christian* lips (partly from inhabitants of Jerusalem, partly perhaps directly from Syrians and Cilicians). The *present* participle does not stand for the *aorist* (Grotius), but quite substantivally: our (former) *persecutor*.[9] — *τὴν πίστιν*] never means *Christian doctrine*,[10] not even in Acts vi. 7, where faith in Christ is conceived as the authority commanding submission (comp. on Rom. i. 5); it denotes *the faith* —regarded, however, *objectively*.[11] He preaches the faith (in the Son of God, ver. 16), which formerly he destroyed. On the latter point Estius justly remarks, "quia Christi fidelibus fidem extorquere persequendo nitebatur," "because by his persecution he was endeavoring to wrest faith from believers."[12] — *ἐν ἐμοί*] does not mean *propter me*,[13] in support of which an appeal was erroneously made to Eph. iv. 1 *et al.*: for *ἐν*, used with persons, is never *on account of* (Winer, p. 363); but it means, "they praised God *on me*," so that their praise of God was based on me as the vehicle and instrument of the divine grace and efficacy (1 Cor. xv. 10). God made Himself known to them by my case, and so they praised Him; *ὅλον γὰρ τὸ κατ' ἐμέ, φησί, τῆς* χάριτος ἦν τοῦ Θεοῦ, "For as to me, all, he says, was of the grace of God," Oecumenius.[1] It was not, however, without a purpose, but with a just feeling of satisfaction, that Paul added καὶ ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸν Θεόν ; for this impression, which Paul then made on the churches in Judaea, stood in startling contrast to the hateful proceedings against him of the Judaizers in Galatia.—Mark further,[2] how ver. 23 rests on the legitimate assumption that Paul preached in substance no other gospel than that which those churches had received from Jerusalem, although they were not yet instructed in the special peculiarities of his preaching ; as, in fact, the antagonism between the Pauline teaching and Judaism did not become a matter of public interest until later (Acts xv. 1).

---

[1] Neither in Acts ix. 26–30 nor in Acts xxvi. 19 f. (see on these passages) is there any such inconsistency with the passage before us, as has been urged against the historical character of the Acts, especially by Hilgenfeld, Baur, and Zeller.

[2] Hofmann appeals to Eur. *Iph. T.* 1367. But in this, as in the other passages quoted by Hartung, I. p. 169, the well-known *repetition of the same word* with δέ occurs.

[3] Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 97.

[4] See Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 39; Winer, p. 586.

[5] See Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 1179.

[6] "*Rumor* apud illos erat," "there was a rumor among them," Erasmus. Comp. Vulgate: "tantum autem *auditum habebant*," "but they only had the tidings."

[7] So most expositors, including Rückert and Wieseler.

[8] Matthies, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Hofmann.

[9] See Winer, p. 331; Bremi, *ad Dem. adv. Aphob.* 17.

[10] Beza, Grotius, Morus, Koppe, Rückert, and others.

[11] Comp. on iii. 2, 23.

[12] Comp. ver. 13.

[13] As was generally assumed before Winer.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

I. Ver. 1. οὐκ απ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ανθρώπου.

"When Meyer asserts a distinction between a *causa remotior* and a *causa medians*, this is not accurate, since the subject treated is not the two causes for the one act of the call, but the authorization of the office, and the call of the person" (Sieffert). "There are few points more characteristic of the apostle's style than his varied but accurate use of prepositions, especially of two or more in the same, or immediately contiguous, clauses" (Ellicott).

II. Ver. 1. ἀνθρώπου.

On the other hand, Eadie : "The change to the singular forms a designed antithesis to the following clause, while it denies the intervention of human agency in any form and to any extent." So also Sieffert. Meyer is supported by Brenz, who, however, loses sight of the distinction in the prepositions — viz., *Per Christum adhuc humanam vitam in terris agentem*, while by the same interpretation the οὐκ ἀπ' ανθρώπων becomes *A duodecim Apostolis*, "By the twelve apostles."

III. Ver. 1. ἀνθρώπου.

The statement requires qualification. Instead of saying : "It was not a man," etc., the author himself would not dissent from the better interpretation of Calovius : οὐκ ψιλὸς ἀνθρώπος. The participation by the entire divine-human person of divine majesty, honor, and dominion does not demand the limitation of a subordination. As to the chief passage quoted (1 Cor. xv. 28) the explanation of Philippi is in point (*Kirchliche Glaubenslehre*, iv. 379) : "That after the attainment of its goal, the Son of God surrenders His place of preeminence as the Head and Leader of humanity, and with respect to the human race returns to His original co-ordination with the Father."

IV. Ver. 1. Θεοῦ πατρός.

Eadie : "The name is probably inclusive of all these relations."

---

[1] Comp. John xvii. 10; Ecclus. xlvii. 6. See generally Bernhardy, p. 210; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 598.

[2] In opposition to Holstein and others.

V. Ver. 1. *Θεοῦ πατρὸς.*

Here Meyer's subordinationism again appears. The climax, however, is to be retained. For while in the Trinity "none is before and after other;" yet with respect to the order of their subsistence, as declared when it is said that one emanates or proceeds from the other, such distinction is correct. Not then "from the Higher to the Highest," with respect to actual diginity, authority, or age, but with regard to their order of working in the economy of grace. The idea here is also: from the incarnate Son to the unincarnate Father; from the God-man to Him who is God and not man; from the Mediator to Him with whom he mediates.

VI. Ver. 1. *τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.*

Luther based this on Rom. iv. 25.

VII. Ver. 4.

For the grace and peace here mentioned are in direct opposition to the legal righteousness of the Jews.

VIII. Ver. 4. *αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος.*

Sieffert protests against this interpretation, and maintains that *αἰών* is not applicable to the period of the world preceding the *Parousia*, and is never so used. As to *ἐνεστώς*, as a perf. part., it may designate what, although having entered for a longer or shorter period, still extends, with its consequences, into the present, hence the present; or more seldom it may mean that which announces itself as threatening. In the latter sense, it occurs in N. T., 1 Cor. vii. 26; 2 Thess. ii. 2. The former meaning, *present*, it has very frequently in profane Greek, and in the N. T. at Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. iii. 22, vii. 26; Heb. ix. 9, and here. For as Rom. viii. 38 contrasts *τὰ ἐνεστῶτα* with *τὰ μέλλοντα*, so here the *αἰών ἐνεστώς* is in manifest antithesis to *αἰῶν μέλλων*, Eph. i. 24 (Matt. xii. 32; Heb. vi. 3), and is therefore the same as what Paul elsewhere terms *ὁ αἰὼν ὅντος*, Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. i. 20, ii. 6, 8, iii. 18; or *ὁ νῦν καιρός*, Rom. viii. 38; or *ὁ αἰων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*, Eph. ii. 2. With this Alford and Eadie concur, and to it Ellicott inclines.

IX. Ver. 4. *ὅπως ἐξέληται.*

Sieffert here again dissents. "As mostly in the LXX. and always in the N. T. (Acts vii. 10, 34, xii. 11, xxiii. 27, xxvi. 17) to liberate from a power. As a further end of the atoning death of Christ it designates as the final statement our deliverance from the power wherewith the present age of the world subjects us to its evil influences, consequently a moral operation, as in 2 Cor. v. 15; Eph. v. 26; Tit. ii. 14. This, with essential correctness, has been the interpretation of nearly all expositors since Chrysostom, although some in modern times, entirely against the connection, think chiefly (de Wette, Meyer, Eadie) or alone (Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.*, § 80) of deliverance from misery, punishment, and danger."

X. Ver. 6. *οὕτω ταχέως.*

"Probably the apostle had no precise time in his reference. The unexpectedness of the apostasy appears to be his prominent element of rebuke" (Eadie).

"In the N. T. ταχέως always stands without the specification of a *terminus a quo*; hence, with the exception of the passage, in which, in combination with a future idea, it includes a temporal reference to the present (1 Cor. iv. 19; Phil. ii. 19, 24; 2 Tim. iv. 9) in an absolute sense (Luke xiv. 21, xvi. 6; John xi. 31; 2 Thess. ii. 2; 1 Tim. v. 22), so also here the more for the reason that the verb μετατίθεστε in the present designates the still progressive development of the apostasy" (Sieffert).

XI. Ver. 6. ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος.

Regarding the ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος as referring to God, the remark of Brenz is worthy of note, that to *turn from God* is therefore, as the argument here shows, not necessarily to become an atheist, or to lapse into heathenism, but simply to hold that "to attain forgiveness of sins and salvation through faith in Christ is not sufficient, and that they must be merited also by the works of the law."

XII. Ver. 7. ἕτερος.

"Even in Matt. xi. 3, adduced by Ellicott to show that ἕτερος does not always keep its distinctive meaning, it may signify not simply another individual, but one different in position and function" (Eadie).

XIII. Ver. 7. τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες.

The τινές is not without a strain of contempt (Paraeus, Eadie). Cf. 2 Cor. iii. 1, x. 2.

XIV. Ver. 8. ἡμεῖς.

Estius, de Wette, Olshausen, Conybeare, regard ἡμεῖς used by enallage for ἔγω. Cf. 2 Cor. x. 2–16. Lightfoot, on the contrary: "St. Paul never seems to use the plural when speaking of himself alone." Luther: "I and my brethren, Timothy, Titus, and as many as with me teach Christ purely." Ellicott maintains that whether there is an enallage or not must be determined from the context; and that while here there is none, yet it may be found in 1 Thess. i. 2.

XV. Ver. 8. ἐξ οὐρανοὺ.

The ἐξ οὐρανοῦ is in distinction from a fallen angel (Olshausen, Eadie).

XVI. Ver. 8. παρ' ὁ εὐηγγελις άμεθα.

On the contrary, Lightfoot: "St. Paul is here asserting the oneness, the integrity of his gospel. It will not brook any rival. It will not suffer any foreign admixture. The idea of 'contrariety,' therefore, is alien to the general bearing of the passage, though independently of the context the preposition might well have this meaning." Alford correctly observes that the preposition really includes both ideas.

XVII. Ver. 10.

This explanation is referred by Sieffert not to the curse twice pronounced, but to the fact that what had been previously uttered in an indefinite and general way, is not repeated with reference to particular persons.

XVIII. Ver. 10. ἄρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπους.

Sieffert seeks to reconcile both views : "With special reference to his opponents, although expressed generally."

XIX. Ver. 11. ἀδελφοί.

"Still dear to him, in spite of their begun aberration, as in iii. 15, iv. 12, v. 13, vi. 1" (Eadie).

XX. Ver. 12. οὐδὲ γὰρ εγὼ.

Sieffert at some length argues that Meyer's statement that the interpretation of οὐδὲ γὰρ, as *neque enim*, is inconsistent with emphasis on the ἐγὼ, is incorrect. He attaches to it a conjunctive force, and derives the antithetical idea from v. 11. That the αὐτός is unnecessary, as Meyer states, is sufficiently disproved by the solitary εγώ in 1 Cor. xi. 23. Ellicott's interpretation impresses us most by extending the subjects of the antithesis even beyond the apostles— viz., "I, as little as any others, whether χριστοδίδακτοι or ἀνθρωποδίδακτοι."

XXI. Ver. 12. οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην.

The οὐδέ belongs to the whole sentence ; the οὔτε connects its parts. See Winer's N. T. Grammar, § 55, 6.

XXII. Ver. 12. δι' ἀποκαλύψεως, κ.τ.λ.

Sieffert regards the period here specified too narrow, as it may have covered the entire time between his call at Damascus and his undertaking the work of apostle to the Gentiles, with which he concludes this review of his life in vv. 21–23.

XXIII. Ver. 14. ἐν τῷ γένει μου.

"An accidental proof that he is addressing Gentile converts" (Lightfoot).

XXIV. Ver. 14. περισσοτέρως ζηλωτὴς, κ.τ.λ.

"We cannot agree with Meyer, followed by Alford, Ellicott, and others, in saying that the adjective and pronoun limit these traditions to the sect of the Pharisees, Paul being φαρισαῖος, υἱὸς φαρισαίου. We rather think, with Wieseler, that the reference must be as wide as the phrase ἐν τῷ γένει" (Lightfoot).

XXV. Ver. 17. εἰς 'Αραβίαν.

The place, the object, and the length of time of the visit to Arabia are alike uncertain. For the indefinite limits of the term Arabia, see especially Conybeare and Howson, Vol. I., 96 sqq. Many, among them Sieffert, locate this visit in a region neighboring Damascus—Arabia Deserta ; others fix it in Arabia Petraea ; still others, in Arabia Felix. As to the object, Sieffert dissents from Meyer, on the ground, that not until ver. 21 sqq. do we find the record of the beginning of his missionary activity, and that the εὐθέως does not limit the εὐαγγέλωμαι, as Meyer intimates. Luther's view harmonizes with that of Meyer : "What else would he have done than preach Christ." But in the absence of all evidence to this effect in Acts, the probabilities incline to its being for a season of quiet preparation in the desert for his great work. As Neander, however, remarks (*Planting and Training of Christian Church*, E. T., p. 93): "Either view equally suits the antithesis in this passage, that Paul did not go up to Jerusalem in order to make his appearance under the sanction of those who were apostles before him." Cf. Schaff's *Hist. of Apostolic Church*, p. 236; Farrar's *Life and Work of St. Paul*, chap. xi. Kitto (*Bible Illustrations*) adopts the hypothesis of a retreat from the heat and insalubrity of Damascus during the summer season.

XXVI. Ver. 18. μετὰ ἔτη τρία.

The argument for the necessity of this partial correction presented in commentary on Acts ix. 26 are insufficient. The interval of three years need not have been three full years, but, like the three days of our Lord's abode with the dead, parts of three years, amounting to little more than a full year. The argument Meyer draws from the distrust of the disciples rests partially on the unproved hypothesis that Paul had spent the interval in Arabia in preaching. He concedes that "the distrust may in some measure be explained from a long retirement in Arabia." For a harmonizing of the two accounts see Excursus A of the volume of the *Handy Commentary* (Sanday) on Galatians.

XXVII. Ver. 18. Ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε.

"While the fifteen days were amply sufficient for the communication of particular historical details which Paul did not regard essential to his gospel, they were actually too short for Paul, after having for three years developed independently in his Christian convictions, to have been advised in spiritual dependence by Peter" (Sieffert).

XXVIII. Ver. 20. τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου.

It is surprising that such interpretation should be given the language of the *Form. Concord.*, which does contain it even by remotest implication. See Müller's edition, p. 679, § 24; English translation (Jacobs), p. 628, § 24. Meyer has evidently in mind the Latin translation of the Smalcald Articles, Müller, p. 299, whose rendering, however, does not make the perpetuity of Mary's virginity confessional. On the Lord's brethren, see the Excursus of Lightfoot.

XXIX. Ver. 20. ἕτερον** οὐκ εἶδον, κ.τ.λ.

"The intention is to show, not as in v. 18, that he has not learned the gospel of the apostles, but that he had not received a formal commission to preach the gospel: as this would have had to proceed from the entire body of apostles" (Sieffert).

CHAPTER II.

Ver. 5. *οἷς οὐδέ*] is wanting in D* Clar.* Germ. codd. Lat. in Jerome and Sedul., Ir. Tert. Victorin. Ambrosiast. Primas. Claudius antissidor.[1] Condemned by Seml., Griesb., Koppe, Dav. Schulz. But the omission is much too weakly attested, and arose simply from *δέ* in ver. 4 being understood antithetically, and from the belief, induced by the remembrance of the apostle's principle of accommodation, that it was necessary to find here an analogue to the circumcision of Timothy (Acts xvi. 3) ; *οὐδέ* stood in the way of this, and with it, on account of the construction, *οἷς* was also omitted. This *οἷς* was wanting at most only in manuscripts of the It. (see Reiche, p. 12), and ought not to have been rejected by Grot., Morus, and Michael. — Ver. 8. *καὶ ἐμοί*] With Lachm. and Tisch., read, according to preponderating testimony, *κἀμοί*. — Ver. 9. *'Ιάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς*] D E F G, It., and several Fathers, have *Πέτρος καὶ 'Ιάκωβος*. A transposition according to rank.[2] — *μέν*, which is wanting in Elz. and Tisch. (bracketed by Lachm.), is to be deleted, according to B F G H K L ℵ*, min. vss. and Fathers. Inserted on account of the *δέ* which follows. — Ver. 11. Here, and also in ver. 14, *Κηφᾶς* and *Κηφᾷ* is the correct reading according to preponderating evidence. Comp. on i. 18. The *very ancient* fiction (see the exegetical note) that it is not the *Apostle* Peter who is here spoken of, testifies also to the originality of the Hebrew name. — Ver. 12. *ἦλθον*] B D* F G ℵ, 45, 73, codd. It., read *ἦλθεν*. So Lachm.[3] Comp. Orig. : *ἐλθόντος 'Ιακώβου*. An ancient clerical error after ver. 11. — Ver. 14. The position of the words *καὶ οὐκ* (Lachm. and Tisch. *οὐχ*) *'Ιουδαϊκῶς ζῇς* is to be adopted, with Lachm., following decisive testimony. No doubt *καὶ οὐκ 'Ιουδαϊκῶς* is wanting in Clar. Germ. Ambrosiast. Sedul. Agapet. ; but this evidence is much too weak to induce us (with Seml. and Schott) to pronounce the words a gloss, especially as their omission might very easily be occasioned by the similar terminations of the two adverbs. — *πῶς*] Elz. Tisch. read *τί*, in opposition to decisive testimony. — The evidence is also decisive against the omission of *δέ*, ver. 16 (Elz.), which was caused by *εἰδότες* being understood as the definition of what precedes, with which view *δέ* was not compatible. The omission was facilitated by the fact of a lesson beginning with *εἰδότες*. — Ver. 18. Instead of *συνίστημι* read, with Griesb., Scholz, Lachm., Tisch., *συνιστάνω*. — Ver. 20. *τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ*] Lachm. reads *τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ*, according to B D* F G, It. But most probably this reading arose from the writer passing on immediately from the first *τοῦ* to the second, and thus writing *τοῦ Θεοῦ* only ; and, as the sequel did not harmonize with this, *καὶ Χριστοῦ* was afterwards added. If, as Schott thinks, *τοῦ Θεοῦ κ. Χριστοῦ* was written because God and Christ are mentioned in vv. 19, 20, the original *τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ* would have been turned into *τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.*

---

[1] Jerome, Sedul., Primas, have the οἷς, but not the οὐδέ.

[2] A. omits καὶ Κηφᾶς.

[3] Who (*Praef.* p. xii.) conjectures as to this reading that τινί should be read instead of τινάς.

υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. If, however, *τοῦ Θεοῦ κ. Χριστοῦ* had been the original text, there would have been no reason whatever for altering this into *τοῦ υἱοῦ τ. Θεοῦ*.

CONTENTS.—Paul continues the historical proof of his full apostolic independence. On his second visit to Jerusalem, fourteen years after, he had laid his gospel before those in repute, and had been, not instructed by them, but formally acknowledged as an apostle ordained by God to the Gentiles (vv. 1–10). And when Peter had come to Antioch, so far was Paul from giving up his apostolic independence, that, on the contrary, he withstood Peter openly on account of a hypocritical line of conduct, by which Christian freedom was imperilled (vv. 11–21).

Ver. 1. On vv. 1–10, see C. F. A. Fritzsche in *Fritzschior. Opusc.* p. 158 ff; Elwert, *Progr. Annott. in Gal.* ii. 1–10, etc., 1852; Reiche, *Comm. Crit.* p. 1 ff. On ver. 1, see Stölting, *Beiträge z. Exeg. d. Paul. Briefe*, 1869, p. 155 ff. [Schwegler, *Nachap. Zeitalt.* I. p. 116 sqq. Baur, *Paulus*, 2d ed. I. p. 119 sqq. Zeller, *Apostelge.* p. 216 sqq. Neander, *Gesch. d. Pflanz.*, 4th ed. p. 208 sqq., American translation, p. 204 sqq. Lechler, *Ap. u. Nachap. Zeitalt.* I. 116 sqq. Ritschl, *Altkath. k.* 1857, p. 128 sqq. Trip, *Paul. nach. d. Apostelgesch.* p. 75 sqq. Oertel, *Paul. in d. Apostelg.* p. 226 sqq. Ebrard, w. *Krit. d. evang. Gesch.* 3d ed. 1868, p. 878 sqq. Lipsius, *Apostel-convent in Schenkel's Bibl. Lex.* 1869. Overbeck, *Apostel geschichte*, 1870, p. 216 sqq. Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, 1873, p. 500 sqq. Weizsäcker, *Apostelkonzil*, *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1873, p. 191 sqq. K. Schmidt, *Apostel-Konvent in Herzog's Realencycl.* 2d ed. 1877. Keim, *Aus. d. Urchr.* 1878, p. 64 sqq. W. Grimm, *Der Apostelkonvent in theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, p. 405 sqq. Schaff's *History of the Apostolic Church*, 249 sqq. Schaff's *Church History*, I. p. 341 sqq. Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, I. 223]. — *ἔπειτα*] *thereafter*, namely, after my sojourn in Syria and Cilicia; correlative to the *ἔπειτα* in i. 21, and also in i. 18. *Ἔπειτα* joins the statement to what is narrated immediately before. Therefore not: after the journey to Jerusalem, i. 18.[1] — *διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν*] *interjectis quatuordecim annis*, *after an interval of fourteen years*.[2] The *length* of this period quite accords with the systematic object of the apostle, inasmuch as he had already, up to the time of this journey, labored for *so many years* entirely on his own footing and *independently of the original apostles*, that this very fact could not but put an end to any suspicion of his being a disciple of these apostles.[3] Following Oeder[4] and Rambach,

---

[1] Wieseler.

[2] Comp. Polyb. xxii. 26. 22, *δι᾽ ἐτῶν τριῶν*; Acts xxiv. 17.

[3] As to the use of *διά*, which is based on the idea that the time intervening from the starting-point to the event in question is *traversed* when the event arrives (comp. Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 856), see generally Bernhardy, p. 235; Krüger, § 68. 22. 3; Winer, p. 336; Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 50, and in *Fritzschior. Opusc.* p. 162 f.; Herod. iv. 1, *ἀποδημήσαντας ὀκτὼ κ. εἴκοσι ἔτεα καὶ διὰ χρόνου τοσούτου* (after so long an interval) *κατιόντας κ.τ.λ.*; Deut. ix. 11, *διὰ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμερῶν*, "at the end of forty days and forty nights" . . . *ἔδωκε κύριος ἐμοὶ τὰς δύο πλάκας*; Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 8. 12. Comp. the well-known *διὰ χρόνου*, Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 8. 1; *δι᾽ αἰῶνος*, Blomfield, *Gloss. ad Aesch. Pers.* 1003; *διὰ μακροῦ*, Thuc. vi. 15. 3; *δι᾽ ἔτους*, Lucian, *Paras.* 15; *δι᾽ ἡμέρων*, Mark ii. 1, and the like; also 4 Macc. xiii. 20.

[4] In Wolf.

Theile,[1] Paulus and Schott have understood διά as *within*, "*during* the 14 years I have now been a Christian;" or, as Stölting, acceding to this explanation, gives to it the more definite sense, "*during a space of time which has lasted* 14 *years from my conversion, and is now, at the time I am writing this epistle, finished.*" But against this view may be urged the grammatical objection that διά is never used by Greek authors with respect to duration of time, except when the action *extends throughout the whole time*,[2] either continuously, as Mark xiv. 58, or at recurring intervals, as Acts i. 3.[3] Even the passages which are appealed to, Acts v. 19, xvi. 9, xvii. 10, xxiii. 31, admit the rendering of διὰ τῆς νυκτός as *throughout the night*, without deviation from the common linguistic usage.[4] Moreover, how unintelligibly Paul would have expressed himself, if, without giving the slightest intimation of it,[5] he had meant the present duration of his standing as a Christian! Lastly, how entirely idle and objectless in itself would be such a specification of time! For that Paul could only speak of *the* journeys which he made *as a Christian* to Jerusalem, was self-evident; but whether at the time when he wrote the epistle his life as a Christian had lasted 14 years, or longer, or shorter, was a point of no importance for the main object of the passage, and the whole statement as to the time would be without any motive in harmony with the context. — *From what point has Paul reckoned the* 14 *years?* The answer, *From the ascension of Christ*,[6] must at once be excluded as quite opposed to the context. Usually, however, the *conversion* of the apostle is taken as the *terminus a quo*,[7] an appeal being made to the analogy of i. 18. Thus the three years of i. 18 would be again included in the fourteen years. But πάλιν and the διά, indicating the *interval* which in the meantime had elapsed, point rather to the *first journey to Jerusalem* as the *terminus a quo*. The πάλιν points back to *the first* journey, and so διὰ δεκατεσσ. ἐτῶν presents itself most naturally as the period intervening between the first journey and this πάλιν. If Paul had again written μετά, as in i. 18, we might have inferred from the intentional identity of expression the identity also of the starting-point; but since he has here chosen the word διά not elsewhere employed by him in this sense (after an *interval* of fourteen years), the relation or this διά to πάλιν leads us to take the first journey to Jerusalem as the starting-point of the reckoning. This is the reckoning adopted by Jerome, Chrysostom on ver. 11, Luther,[8]

---

[1] In Winer's *Neue krit. Jour.* VIII. p. 175.

[2] Valckenaer, *ad Herod.* vi. 12; Ast, *ad Plat. de Leg.* p. 399.

[3] See *Fritzschior. Opusc. l.c.*

[4] See on these passages the *Commentary on Acts.* There is no cause for accusing (with Fritzsche) Luke of an improper deviation from the Greek *usus loquendi.* Comp. on διὰ νυκτός, Thuc. ii. 4. 1; Xen. *Anab.* iv. 6. 22. On the Homeric διὰ νύκτα, *during* the night, see Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 222, ed. 3.

[5] Possibly by ἐξ οὗ ἐν Χριστῷ εἰμι, "from when I am in Christ," or in some other way.

[6] Chronic. Euseb., Peter Lombard, Lud. Cappellus, Paulus.

[7] So Olshausen, Anger, Matthies, Schott, Fritzsche, Baumgarten-Crusius, Wieseler, Hilgenfeld, Ebrard, Ewald, *apost. Zeit.* p. 55, Stölting, Eadie.

[8] In the Commentary of 1519 (*Opp.* Jena 1612, I. p. 336 B), "Post annos 14, quibus si annos tres, quos supra memoravit, adjunxeris, jam 17 aut 18 annos eum praedicasse invenies, antequam conferre voluerit," "After 14 years, and if to these you add the three which he mentioned above, you will

Ussher, Clericus, Lightfoot, Bengel, Stroth,[1] Morus, Keil, Koppe, Borger, Hug, Mynster, Credner, Hemsen, Winer, Schrader, Rückert, Usteri, Zeller, Reiche, Bleek, and others, as also by Hofmann, who, however, labors under an erroneous view as to the whole aim of the section beginning with i. 21.[2] — δεκατεσσάρων] emphatically placed *before* ἐτῶν (differently in i. 18), in order to denote the *long* interval.[3] — πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσ.] Paul can mean by this no other than his *second*[4] journey to Jerusalem, and he says that between his first and his renewed (πάλιν) visit to it a period of 14 years had elapsed, during which he had not been there. If Paul had meant a *third* journey, and had kept silence as to the *second*, he would have furnished his opponents, to whom he desired to prove that he was not a disciple of the apostles, with weapons against himself; and the suspicion of intentionally incomplete enumeration would have rested on him justly, so far as his adversaries were concerned. Indeed, even if on occasion of a second visit to Jerusalem, here passed over, he had not come at all into close contact with the apostles (and how highly improbable this would be in itself!), he would have been the less likely to have omitted it, as, in this very character of a journey which had had nothing to do with any sort of instruction by the apostles,[5] it would have been of the greatest importance for his object, in opposition to the suspicions of his opponents.[6] To have kept silence as to this journey would have cut the sinews of his whole *historically* apologetic demonstration, which he had entered upon in i. 13 and still continues from i. 21 (though Hofmann thinks otherwise).[7] This purely exegetical ground is quite decisive in favor of the view that Paul here speaks of his *second* journey to Jerusalem;[8] and considered by itself, therefore, our passage pre-

---

find that he had been preaching 17 or 18 years already before he wished to confer." Even with *this* reckoning, his conversion still remains "the great event by which Paul measures for himself all Christian time" (Ewald); for the whole reckoning begins at i. 18 from this event as its starting-point.

[1] In the *Repert. für bibl. u. morgenl. Lit.* IV. p. 41.

[2] See on i. 22.

[3] Comp. Herod. *l.c.*

[4] Very correctly put in the *Chron. Euseb.*, ὃ εἶπε πάλιν, δηλονότι ἑτέρα ἐστὶν ἀνάβασις αὕτη, "in that he says again, it is manifest that this is another journey."

[5] Comp. i. 18.

[6] Wieseler's objection that Paul, according to our view of his historical argument, would also have left unmentioned the journey spoken of in Acts xviii. 22, whereby the reasoning above would fall to the ground as *nimium probans*, "proving too much," is incorrect. For if he had shown that *up to the apostolic council* (see the sequel) he could not have received the instruction of the apostles, his task of proof was *completely solved;* because on occasion of his presence at that council he received formal acknowledgment and sanction as the apostle to the Gentiles. If up to that time he had not been a disciple of the apostles, now, when he had received in an official way the fullest acknowledgment as an independent apostle, there could no longer be any discussion as to his having at some subsequent date procured apostolic instruction in Jerusalem. It would therefore have been purely unmeaning, and even absurd, to have continued the history of his journeys to Jerusalem beyond the date of the apostolic council. But *up to that date* he could not *omit any* journey, without rendering his historical deduction *nugatory as a proof.*

[7] Comp. also Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 55.

[8] Bloch, *Chronotax.* p. 67 f., and Schott find *two* journeys mentioned in ver. 1: the former obtains them from πάλιν (after 14 years I made the second journey to Jerusalem, undertaken with Barnabas); and the latter brings them out thus: "intra 14 annos iterata vice adscendi Hierosolymas, cum Barnaba quidem (Act. xi. 30), posthac (Act. xv.) assumto etiam Tito," "The go-

sents no difficulty at all. The difficulty only arises when we compare it with Acts. According to the latter, the *second* journey (Acts xi. 30, xii. 25) is that which Paul made with Barnabas in the year 44 in order to convey pecuniary assistance to Judaea ; hence many hold our journey as identical with that related in Acts xi. 30, xii. 25. So Tertullian *c. Marc.* i. 20, *Chron. Euseb.*, Calvin,[1] Keil (*Opusc.* p. 160, and in Pott's *Sylloge*, III. p. 68), Gabler (*neutest. theol. Journ.* II. 2, p. 210 ff.), Rosenmüller, Süskind (in Bengel's *Archiv.* I. 1, p. 157 ff.), Bertholdt, Kuinoel (*ad Act.* p. xxv.), Heinrichs (*ad Act.* p. 59), Tychsen (*on Koppe*, p. 149), Niemeyer (*de temp. quo ep. ad Gal. conscr. sit*, Gott. 1827), Paulus, Guericke (*Beitr.* p. 80 ff.), Küchler (*de anno, quo Paul. ad sacra Chr. convers. est*, Lips. 1828, p. 27 ff.), Flatt, Fritzsche, Böttger, Stölting. So also Caspari (*geograph. chronol. Einl. in d. Leb. Jesu*, 1869). But the chronology, through the 14 years, is decisively opposed to this view. For as the year 44 A.D. or 797 U.C. is the established date of the journey in question,[2] these 14 years with the addition of the three years (i. 18) would carry us back to the year 27 A.D. ! Among the defenders of this view, Böttger has indeed turned δεκατεσσάρων into τεσσάρων ; but how little he is justified in this, see below. Fritzsche, on the other hand, has endeavored to bring out the 14 years, by supposing the reckoning of Luke iii. 1 to begin from the year of the *joint* regency of Tiberius, that is, the year 765 U.C., as, following Ussher, has been done by Clericus, Lardner, and others,[3] and now also by Wieseler.[4] It is assumed, consequently, that Christ commenced His ministry in 779, and was crucified in 781 ; that Paul became a Christian at the beginning of 783, and that 14 years later, in 797, the journey in question to Jerusalem took place. But against the assumption that the 14 years are to be reckoned from Paul's conversion, see above. Besides, the year of the conversion cannot, for other chronological reasons, be put back beyond the year 35 A.D., that is, 788 U.C.[5] Lastly, the hypothesis, that Luke in iii. 1 did not reckon from the actual commencement of the reign of Tiberius, is nothing but a forced expedient based on extraneous chronological combinations, and finding no support at all in the plain words of Luke himself.[6] The opinion,

---

ing up to Jerusalem having been repeated within 14 years, with Barnabas indeed (Acts xi. 30), and afterwards Titus also having been taken." Both views are *introduced* into the passage inconsistently with the text. For according to Bloch's explanation, Paul must have spoken previously of a journey made with Barnabas ; and in Schott's interpretation not only is διά wrongly understood (see above), but it would be necessary at least that instead of συμπαραλ. καὶ Τίτον the text should run, εἶτα δὲ συμπαραλ. κ. Τ. Nevertheless Lange, *apostol. Zeitalt.* I. p. 99 f., has again resorted to the evasion that πάλιν is to be referred to μετὰ Βαρν. and presupposes an earlier journey already made *with Barnabas* (Acts xi.)

[1] Among the older expositors, J. T. Major is also named as in favor of this view, whose *Annotata ad Acta Ap.* Jen. 1647, 8vo, are quoted by Gabler and Winer. But in the *second* edition of Major's *Annotata*, which appeared after his death, Jena 1670, 4to, Major (p. 410 ff.) pronounces decidedly for the view which holds the journey mentioned in Gal. ii. 1 to be identical with that in Acts xv.

[2] See *Introd. to Acts.*

[3] See on Luke iii. 1.

[4] In Herzog's *Encykl.* XXI. p. 547 ff., and especially in his *Beitr. z. Würdigung d. Evang.* 1869, p. 177 ff.

[5] See on Acts, *Introd.*

[6] See further, in opposition to it, Anger, *rat. temp.* p. 14 f., and *z. Chronol. d. Lehramtes Chr.* I.

therefore, that the journey Gal. ii. 1 is identical with that mentioned in Acts xi., must be rejected ; and we must, on the other hand, assume that *in point of fact* those expositors have arrived at the correct conclusion who consider it as the same which, according to Acts xv., was undertaken by Paul and Barnabas to the apostolic conference.[1] This result is, however, to be based in the first instance not on a comparison of the historical references contained in Gal. ii. and Acts xv., but on διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν ; and the historical references of Acts xv. afterwards serve merely as a partial, although very material, confirmation. For the point of view, from which the journey is brought forward in our passage, is one so special and subjective, that it cannot present itself in the connected objectively historical narrative of Acts, whether we take it in connection with Acts xi. or Acts xv. By the search for points of agreement and of difference, with the view of thereby arriving at a decision, far too much room is left for argument *pro* and *contra*, and consequently for the play of subjective influences, to reach any certain result.

I. Thus in support of the identity of the journey Gal. ii. 1 with that of Acts xi. xii., it is argued[2]—(1.) That the journey follows on the sojourn in Cilicia and Syria (i. 21, ii. 1 ; comp. Acts ix. 30, xi. 25 ff.). But why should not Paul, in the ἔπειτα, ii. 1, have also mentally included his first missionary journey (to Cyprus, Pamphylia, Pisidia, and Lycaonia, Acts xiii. xiv.) as preceding, seeing that he made this journey from Antioch and after its completion again abode in Antioch for a considerable time, and seeing that his object made it important not so much to write a special history of his labors, as to show at what time he had first come into closer official connection with the apostles, in order to make it plain that he had not learnt from them ? (2.) That it is probable that Paul *soon* after the beginning of his labors as the apostle to the Gentiles (Gal. i. 23 ; Acts xi. 25 f. ; comp. Acts xv. 23, ix. 30) expounded his system of teaching at Jerusalem, and laid it before the apostles for their opinion. But this argument proves too much, since it is evident from i. 16 that Paul commenced the exercise of his vocation as an apostle to the Gentiles immediately after his conversion ; so that, even if the 14 years be reckoned from the conversion, there still remains this long period of 14 years during which Paul allowed this alleged requirement to be unsatisfied. According to our interpretation of ii. 1, this period is increased from 14 to 17 years ; but, if Paul had taught 14 years without the approbation of the apostles, he may just as well have done so for 17 years.

---

[1] So Irenaeus, *adv. haer.* iii. 13, Theodoret, Jerome, Baronius, Cornelius à Lapide, Pearson, and most of the older expositors, Semler, Koppe, Stroth, Vogel (in Gabler's *Journ. für auserl. theol. Lit.* I. 2, p. 249 ff.), Haselaar, Borger, Schmidt (*Einl.* I. p. 192 and in the *Analect.* III. 1), Eichhorn, Hug, Winer, Hemsen, Feilmoser, Hermann (*de P. ep. ad Gal. tribus prim. capp.*, Lips. 1832), Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, Anger, Schneckenburger, Neander, Baumgarten-Crusius, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Zeller, Lekebusch, Elwert, Lechler (*apost. u. nachapost. Zeitalt.* p. 394 ff.), Thiersch, Reuss, Reiche, Ewald, Ritschl, Bleek, Ellicott, Hofmann, Laurent, Holsten, Trip, Oertel, Lipsius, Pfleiderer, Weizsäcker, K. Schmidt, Keim, Lightfoot, Eadie, and others. Rückert does not come to a decision, but (in his Commentary and in the *exeget. Mag.* I. 1, p. 118 ff.) denies the identity of our journey with that related in Acts xi. xii., and leaves it a matter of doubt whether the journey mentioned in Acts xv. or that in xviii. 22 is the one intended.

[2] See Fritzsche, *l.c.* p. 227.

(3). That the sanction given to Paul and Barnabas as apostles to the Gentiles (ii. 9) must have been consequent on the journey mentioned in Acts xi. xii., because otherwise the Holy Spirit would not have set them apart (Acts xiii. 2 f.) as apostles to the Gentiles. But might not the ordination of the two to be teachers of the Gentiles (Acts xiii. 2) have taken place *previously*, and the formal acknowledgment of this destination on the part of the apostles in Jerusalem have *followed* at a subsequent period? This latter view, indeed, is supported even by the analogy of *αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν* (Gal. ii. 9), inasmuch as James, Peter, and John had been already for a long time before this apostles to the Jews, but now arranged that as their destination formally in concert with Paul and Barnabas. (4.) That the stipulation respecting the poor (ii. 10) was occasioned by the very fact of Paul and Barnabas having brought pecuniary assistance (Acts xi. 30). But the care for the poor lay from the very beginning of the church so much at its heart, and was so much an object of apostolic interest (Acts ii. 44 f., iv. 34 ff., vi. 1 ff.), that there was certainly no need of any special occasion for expressly making the remembrance of the poor one of the conditions in the concert, ii. 9 f. (5.) That the apostles, according to ii. 3, had insisted on the circumcision of Titus,—a non-emancipation from Mosaism, which might agree with the time of Acts xi. xii., when the conversion of the Gentiles was still in its infancy, but not with the later time of Acts xv. But see the *note* on ver. 3. Even if we allow the erroneous idea that the apostles had required this circumcision, we should have to consider that James at a much later point (Acts xxi. 17 ff.) required Paul to observe a completely Jewish custom, from which it is evident how much, even at a very late date, the Jewish apostles accommodated themselves to the Jewish Christians, and Paul also assented to it. (6.) That in Acts xv. there is no trace of the presence of John at Jerusalem. But although John is not mentioned by name, he may very well have been included in the general *οἱ ἀπόστολοι* (Acts xv.). (7.) Lastly, Fritzsche remarks, "Paulum novem circiter annos in Cilicia commoratum esse (v. Act. ix. 30, xi. 25; Gal. i. 18, cf. Gal. ii. 1; Act. xi. 30), quis tandem, quum multorum ab apostolis actorum memoria aboleverit . . . praefracte negare sustineat?" etc.[1] Paul may certainly have been a long time in Syria and Cilicia, but *how* long, must remain entirely undetermined after what we have remarked on (1). Besides these arguments[2] it has been urged[3] that the conduct of Peter at Antioch (ii. 11 ff.) is too contradictory to the apostolic decree of Acts xv. to permit our identifying the journey in question with that made to the conference; that in the whole of the epistle Paul makes no mention at all of the authority of the conference; and lastly, that

---

[1] "That Paul tarried about nine years in Cilicia, who then would venture to persistently deny since the memory of many acts had perished from the memory of the apostles?"

[2] As a revelation afforded to Paul himself must certainly be intended, the assertion often brought forward, that *κατ' ἀποκάλυψιν* in ii. 2 applies to the narrative about the prophet Agabus (Acts xi. 28 ff.), is so evidently incorrect, that it does not merit notice. Also the special ground brought forward by Böttger, in order to confirm the identity of the journey Gal. ii. 1 with that described in Acts xi. xii., carries with it its own refutation. See, on the contrary, Rückert, in the *Magaz. f. Exeg. u. Theol. des N. T.* I. 1, p. 118 ff.

[3] See especially Süskind and Keil.

after the conference Paul judged more mildly as to the nullity of circumcision than he does in our epistle. But nothing can be built on these arguments ; since (*a*) even if our journey were that mentioned in Acts xi. xii., still the reproach of inconstancy (grounded on his natural temperament) would rest upon Peter, because he had in fact at an earlier period been already divinely instructed and convinced of the admissibility of the Gentiles to Christianity (Acts x. 8 ff., xi. 2 ff.) ; (*b*) in the principle of his apostolic independence Paul had quite sufficient motive[1] for not mentioning the apostolic decree, especially when dealing with the Galatians ;[2] and lastly (*c*) the severe judgment of the apostle as to the nullity of circumcision in our letter was, in his characteristic manner, adapted altogether to the *polemical* interest of the moment : for that he should pass judgment on the same subject, according to circumstances, sometimes more severely and sometimes more mildly, accords completely with the vigorous freedom and elasticity of his mind. Hence the passages cited for the freer view (Acts xvi. 3 ; 1 Cor. ix. 20 ff. ; Acts xxi. 20 ff.) cannot furnish any absolute standard. — II. To prove the identity of our journey with that of Acts xv., appeals have been made to the following arguments : (1) That Titus, whom Paul mentions in ii. 1, is included in *τινας ἄλλους ἐξ αὐτῶν*, Acts xv. 2 ; (2) That in ver. 2, *ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγ. ὃ κηρ. ἐν τοῖς ἔθν.* is parallel to Acts xv. 4, 12 ; (3) That the Judaizers mentioned in Acts xv. 5 are identical with the *παρεισάκτοις ψευδαδέλφοις*, Gal. ii. 4 ; (4) That the result of the apostolic discussions recorded in Acts xv. quite corresponds with *ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Τίτος . . . ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι*, Gal. ii. 3 ; (5) That in an historical point of view, Gal. ii. 11 agrees exactly with Acts xv. 30 ; (6) That in Acts xi. Barnabas still has precedence of Paul, which, however, is no longer the case throughout in Acts xv. (only in vv. 12, 25) ; (7) That in our epistle Paul could not have omitted to mention the important journey of Acts xv. But on the part of those who look upon our journey as that related in Acts xi. xii., or even in Acts xviii. 22,[3] such grounds for doubt are urged against all of these points,[4] that they cannot be used at least for an independent and full *demonstration* of the identity of our journey with that of Acts xv., but merely furnish an important partial *confirmation* of the proof otherwise adduced ; to say nothing of the fact that the accounts in Gal. ii. and Acts xv. present also points of difference, from which attempts have been made with equal injustice to deny the whole historical parallel, and to abandon unduly the historical truth of the 15th chapter of the Acts.[5]—The result of all the discussion is as follows :—*As Paul, in accordance with his own clear words in Gal.* ii. 1 *as well as with his whole plan and aim in the passage, can mean no other journey whatever except the second which he made as an apostle to Jerusalem; and as, moreover, the* διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν *forbids our thinking of that journey which is related in Acts* xi. xii. *as the second ; the journey represented by him in Gal.* ii. 1 *as his second journey must be held to be the same as that represented by Luke in Acts* xv. *as the third,—an identity which is also con-*

---

[1] Comp. *Introd.* § 3.

[2] Comp. Ritschl, *altkathol. K.* p. 149.

[3] Wieseler.

[4] See especially, Fritzsche *l.c.* p. 224 ff. ; Wieseler, p. 557 ff.

[5] Baur, Schwegler, Zeller, Hilgenfeld, Holsten.

firmed by the historical parallels to be found in Gal. ii. *and Acts* xv.[1] In this way, doubtless, the account of the Epistle to the Galatians conflicts with that of Acts ;[2] but, in the circumstances, it is not difficult to decide on which side the historical truth lies. [See Note XXX., p. 95.] The account of Luke, as given in Acts xi. xii., that *Paul* came to Jerusalem with Barnabas to convey the moneys collected, must be described as *in part unhistorical.* Perhaps (for it is not possible definitely to prove how this partial inaccuracy originated) Paul went only a part of the way with Barnabas (Acts xi. 30), and then, probably even before reaching Judaea (see below), induced by circumstances unknown to us, allowed Barnabas to travel alone to Jerusalem ; and thereafter the latter again met Paul on his way back, so that both returned to Antioch together (Acts xii. 25), but Barnabas only visited Jerusalem in person. Schleiermacher[3] assumes an error on the part of Luke as author ; that, misled by different sources, he divided the one journey, Acts xv., into two different journeys, Acts xi. and xv. But the total dissimilarity of the historical connection, in which these journeys are placed by the narrative of Acts, makes us at once reject this supposition ; as, indeed, it cannot possibly be entertained without unjustifiably giving up Luke's competency for authorship, and by consequence his credibility, in those portions of his book in which he was not an eye-witness of the facts. Credner also[1] has pronounced himself inclined to the hypothesis of an error on the part of Luke. He, however, makes the apostle travel with Barnabas (Acts xi. xii.) as far as Judaea, only not as far as the capital; assuming that Paul remained among the churches of the country districts, and made the acquaintance with them presupposed in i. 22–24, Rom. xv. 19. But, on the one hand, looking at his apostolic interest, it is not in itself probable that, having arrived in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, he would fail, after so long an absence, to be drawn towards the mother-seat of the church, especially when he had come as deputy from Antioch; on the other hand, we should expect that, in order to preclude his opponents from any opportunity of misrepresenting him, he would have briefly mentioned this presence in Judaea (comp. i. 22), and mentioned it in fact with the express remark that at that time he had not entered Jerusalem itself. And, as regards the acquaintance with the churches in the country districts presupposed in i. 22–24, he may have made it sufficiently during the journey to the conference. The fact itself, that Paul during the journey recorded in Acts xi. was *not* at Jerusalem,[2] remains independent of the possible modes of explaining the so far unhistorical account there given. — *μετὰ Βαρνάβα*] The following *συμπαραλ. κ. Τίτον* shows that Paul recognized himself as on this occasion the chief person, which agrees with Acts xv. 2, but not with Acts xi. 25, 30, xii. 25. —*συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον*] *having taken along with us* (as travelling companion) *also Titus*. This *καὶ* finds its reference in *μετὰ Βαρνάβα*, to which the *σύν* in *συμπαραλ.* also refers; not *among others also* (Wieseler),—a meaning which is not suggested by the text. Whether, however, at Acts xv. 2, Titus is meant to be included in *καί τινας ἄλλους ἐξ αὐτῶν*, must remain an open question. If he is meant to be included, then our passage serves to put the statement on the more exact historical footing, that Titus was not *sent* with the others by the church at Antioch, but *was taken by Paul on his own behoof*. The idea that he was sent on the part of the *opposite party*[3] cannot, on a correct view of Acts *l.c.*, be entertained at all. [See Note XXXI., p. 95.]

---

[1] Accordingly, the opinions that our passage relates to a journey still later than that reported in Acts xv. fall to the ground of themselves, for the journey Acts xv. can neither be historically disputed nor can it have been omitted by Paul. Following Jac. Cappellus, Whiston, and others, Köhler (*Abfassungsz.* p. 8) has found our journey in Acts xviii. 22,—a view more recently defended by Wieseler, *Chronologie d. ap. Zeitalt.* p. 201 ff., and *Komment.* p. 553 ff., also in Herzog's *Encykl.* XIX. art. *Galaterbrief;* but Schrader transfers it to the interval between vv. 20 and 21 of Acts xix.—to the time of the composition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Against Köhler and Schrader, see especially Schott, *Erörterung*, p. 22 ff. ; Wurm, in the *Tübing. Zeitschr.* 1833, I. p. 50 ff. ; Anger, *rat. temp.* p. 153 ff. According to Epiph. *Haer.* xxviii. 4, even the journey of Acts xxi. 15–17 is the one intended ! Against Wieseler, who is supported by Lutterbeck, see Baur in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1849, p. 460 ff. ; Zeller, *Apost.* p. 218 f. ; Hilgenfeld, in his *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1860, p. 144 ff. ; Möller on de Wette (ed. 3), p. 35 ff. Comp. also Düsterdieck in *Reuter's Repert.* Sept. 1849, p. 222 ; Schaff, *Gesch. d. chr. K.* I. p. 181 ff. [Am. Rev. Ed. I. p. 335 sqq.], Holtzmann, in Schenkel's *kirchl. Zeitschr.* 1860, 8, p. 55 ff. ; Ebrard, and others. It is unnecessary for us here to go further into Wieseler's arguments from an exegetical point of view ; for the supposition of some later journey than Acts xv. must at all events from Gal. ii. 1 appear an *exegetical impossibility*, so long as we allow this much at least of truth to the Acts of the Apostles —that Paul was at the apostolic council. The journey to this council *cannot* have been passed over by Paul in his narrative given in our passage ; and consequently the journey Acts xviii. 22—which, too, he cannot have taken in company with Barnabas (Acts xv. 36 ff.)—*cannot* have been the one intended by him. This is completely sufficient to invalidate even the latest discussions of Wieseler. Reiche aptly observes (*Comm. crit.* p. 3) : "Paulus aut non affuisse in apostolorum conventu Act. xv., aut male causae suae consuluisse, silentio id praeteriens, censendus esset," "Paul would have to be regarded either as not having been present at the apostolic conference, Acts 15, or, by passing it over in silence, to have administered his cause unsuccessfully."

[2] Hofmann (with whom Laurent agrees) still contents himself with the superficial current evasion, that Paul had no need to mention the journey related in Acts xi., because it did not afford his opponents any matter for suspicion. As if his opponents were to be reckoned so innocent and guileless in their judgment, and as if Paul would not have been shrewd enough to see the use that would be made of his *passing over in silence* one of the journeys made by him to the seat of the apostles !

[3] *Einl. in's N. T.* p. 369 f.

Note. — Τεσσάρων, which Ludwig Cappellus, Grotius, Semler, Keil, Bertholdt, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others, also Guericke, Rinck, Küchler, Böhl, Matthaei (*Religionsl. d. Ap.* I. p. 624), Schott (in his *Isagoge*, p. 196, not in his later writings), Wurm, Ulrich, and Böttger, wish to read instead of δεκατεσσάρων, is a mere conjectural emendation on chronological grounds, confirmed by no authority whatever, not even by the *Chronic. Euseb.*, from the words of which it is, on the contrary, distinctly evident that the chronographer *read δεκατεσσάρων*,[4] but on account of the chronology, because he took the journey for that recorded in Acts xi. xii., *suggested* τεσσάρων.[1] See Anger, *Rat. temp.* 128 ff.; Fritzsche, *l.c.* p. 160 ff. ; Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 206 f. Nevertheless Reiche, in the *Comm. Crit.*, has again judged it necessary to read τεσσάρων, specially because the few matters related of Paul in Acts x.–xv. cannot be held compatible with his having been seventeen years an apostle, and also because so early a conversion, as must be assumed from the reading δεκατεσσάρων, does not agree with Acts i.–ix., several of the narratives of which, it is alleged, lead us to infer a longer, perhaps a ten years', interval between the ascension of Christ and the conversion of the apostle ; as indeed the existence of churches already established in Judaea at the time of this conversion (Gal. i. 22) points to the same conclusion, and 2 Cor. xii. 2 ff., where the ἀποκάλυψις refers to the conversion, agrees with τεσσάρων, but not with δεκατεσσάρων in our passage. But when we consider the great incompleteness and partial inaccuracy of the first half of Acts, the possibility of explaining the establishment of the Judaean churches even in a shorter period embracing some four years, and the groundlessness of the view that 2 Cor. xii. 2 (see on the passage) applies to the conversion of the apostle, these arguments are too weak to make us substitute a *conjecture* for an *unanimously* attested *reading.*

---

[1] *Einl.* I. 1, p. 315.

[2] Which is admitted by Neander, ed. 4, p. 188, following Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 55, and has been turned to further account by Baur and his school against the historical character of the narrative of the Acts; see on Acts xi. 30.

[3] Fritzsche.

[4] Τῷ εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν διὰ ιδ΄ ἐτῶν δοκεῖ μοι τοὺς χρόνους τῶν ἀποστόλων τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς ἀναλήψεως ἀριθμεῖν αὐτὸν. . . . Καὶ εἰ μὴ τοῦτο δῶμεν, εὑρεθήσεται ὁ χρόνος ἀφ' οὗ ἐβαπτίσθη καὶ ἀνέβλεψεν, ὡς περιέχουσιν αἱ Πράξεις, ἔτη δ΄, "By his saying after fourteen years, he seems to me to number the times of the apostles from the Ascension. If we do not grant this, the time will be found to be that from which he was baptized and looked up, four years as comprised in Acts."

Ver. 2. Δέ] continuing the narrative, with emphatic repetition of the same word, as in Rom. iii. 22 ; 1 Cor. ii. 6 ; Phil. ii. 8, *et al.*[2] — κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν] *in conformity with a revelation received.* What an essential element for determining the bearing of the whole narrative ! Hence ἀνέβ. δὰ κ. ἀπ. is not parenthetical (Matthias). But *what kind of* ἀποκάλυψις it was—whether it was imparted to the apostle by means of an ecstasy (Acts xxii. 17 ; 2 Cor. xii. 1 ff.), or of a nocturnal appearance (Acts xvi. 9, xviii. 19, xxiii. 11, xxvii. 23), or generally by a prophetic vision (so Ewald), or by a communication from the Spirit (Acts xvi. 6, 7, xx. 22, 23), or in some other mode—remains uncertain. According to Acts xv. 2, he was *deputed by the church of Antioch* to Jerusalem ; but with this statement our κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν does not conflict :[3] it simply specifies a circumstance having reference to Paul himself individually, that had occurred either before or after that resolution of the church, and was probably quite unknown to Luke. Luke narrates the outward cause, Paul the inward motive of the concurrent divine suggestion, which led to this his journey ; the two accounts together give us its historical connection *completely.* Comp. Acts x., in which also a revelation and the messengers of Cornelius combine in determining Peter to go to Caesarea. The state of the case would have to be conceived as similar, even if our journey were considered identical with that related Acts xi. xii., in which case κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν would apply not—possibly—to the prophesying of Agabus, but likewise to a divine revelation imparted *to Paul himself.* Hermann,[4] as before him Schrader, and after him Dav. Schulz,[5] have explained it : "*explicationis causa*, i.e., ut patefieret inter ipsos, quae vera esset Jesu doctrina," "for the purpose of explanation, i.e., that among them it might be made known what was the true doctrine of Jesus." No doubt κατά might express this relation.[1] But, on the one hand, the account of Acts as to the occasion of our journey does not at all require any explaining away of the revelation (see above); and, on the other hand, it would by no means be necessary, as Hermann considers that on our interpretation it would, that κατὰ τινα ἀποκάλυψιν should have been written, since Paul's object is not to indicate some sort of revelation which was not to be more precisely defined by him, but to express the *qualifying* circumstance that he had gone up not of his own impulse, but at the divine command, not ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, but κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, *conformably to revelation*. Moreover, it is the only meaning consonant with the aim of the apostle, who from the beginning of the epistle has constantly in view his apostolic dignity, that here also, as in i. 12, 6, ἀποκάλ. should express *a divine revelation*,[2] as in fact the word is constantly used in the N. T. in this higher sense.[3] — ἀνεθέμην] *I laid before them*, for information and examination.[4] — αὐτοῖς] that is, *the Christians at Jerusalem*, according to the well-known use of the pronoun for the inhabitants of a previously named city or province.[5] The restriction of the reference to the *apostles*,[6] who are of course not excluded, is, after εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, even still more arbitrary[7] than the view which confines it to the *presbyterium* of the church.[8] Reuss also[9] wrongly denies the consultation of the *congregation*. — τὸ εὐαγγ. ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθν.] The main doctrine of which is that of *justification by faith*. Chrysostom aptly remarks, τὸ χωρὶς περιτομῆς. The *present tense* denotes the identity which was still *continuing* at the time the epistle was written;[10] ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι does not, however, mean *among the nations*,[11] but that it was his gospel *to the Gentiles* which Paul laid before the mother-church of *Jewish* Christianity. [1]— *κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσι*] *sc. ἀνεθέμην τὸ εὐαγγ. ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθν.* *But apart*, that is, in one or more separate conferences, *to those of repute.*[2] Τοῖς δοκοῦσι singles out the *aestumatos* from the body of Christians at Jerusalem. This, however, is not meant to apply to members of the church generally in good repute,[3] but (see on ver. 9) to *James* the brother of Christ, *Peter*, and *John*. The other apostles who were still alive appear already to have ceased from personal connection with the church at Jerusalem. Vv. 6, 7, 9 show that it is not the anti-Pauline partisan *adherents* of those three who are referred to ;[4] and, indeed, it would have been entirely opposed to his apostolic character to lay his gospel specially before δοκοῦσι *in this sense.* Moreover, the designation of the three apostles as οἱ δοκοῦντες is not "an ironical side-glance,"[5] nor has it proceeded from the irritation of a bitter feeling against those who had habitually applied this expression to these apostles ;[6] but it is used in a purely historical sense : for an ironical designation at this point, when Paul is about to relate his *recognition* on the part of the earlier apostles, would be utterly devoid of tact, and would not be at all consonant either with the *point of view of a colleague*, which he constantly maintains in respect to the other apostles, or with the *humility* with which he regards this collegiate relation (1 Cor. xv. 8 ff.). He has, however, *purposely chosen* this expression ("*the authorities*"), because the very matter at stake was his *recognition.* Homberg, Paulus and Matthies wrongly assert that τοῖς δοκοῦσι means *putantibus*, "those thinking," and that the sequel belongs to it, "*qui putabant, num forte in vanum currerem,*" "who thought that perhaps I had run in vain." Vv. 5, 6, 9 testify against this interpretation ; and the introduction of φοβεῖσθαι into the notion of δοκεῖν is arbitrary, and cannot be supported by such passages as Hom. *Il.* x. 97, 101.[7] Besides, it would have been inconsistent with apostolic dignity to give such a private account to those who were suspicious. In classical authors also οἱ δοκοῦντες, without anything added to define it, means *those of repute, who are much esteemed, nobiles.*[8]—But *why* did Paul *submit his gospel* not merely to the Christians in Jerusalem generally, *but also specially to the three apostles?* By both means he desired to remove every suspicion which might anywhere exist in the minds of others,[9] that he was laboring or had labored in vain ; but how easy it is to understand that, for this purpose, he had to address to the apostles a more thorough and comprehensive statement, and to bring forward proofs, experiences, explanations, deeper dialectic deductions, etc.,[1] which would have been unsuitable for the general body of Christians, among whom nothing but the simple and popular exposition was appropriate! Therefore Paul dealt with his colleagues κατ' ἰδίαν. But we must not draw a distinction as to *matter* between the public and the private discussion, as Estius and others have done: "publice ita contulit, ut ostenderet gentes non debere circumcidi et servare legem Mosis . . . privato autem et secreto colloquio cum apostolis habito placuit ipsos quoque Judaeos ab observantia Mosaicae Legis . . . esse liberandos," etc., "In public he devoted himself to the proof that the Gentiles are under no obligation to be circumcised and observe the law of Moses; but in the private and secret conference held with the apostles, it was resolved that even the Jews should be liberated from the observance of the Mosaic law." In this way Paul would have set forth only the *half* of *his* gospel to the mass of the Christians there; and yet this half-measure, otherwise so opposed to his character, would not have satisfied the Jewish-Christian exclusiveness. Thiersch also wrongly holds[2] that the subject of the private discussion was Paul's *apostolic dignity;* it was nothing else than τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κ.τ.λ., and only *in so far* his apostolic legitimacy. The *object* of the private discussion was, in Winer's opinion: "ut non, si his videretur P. castigandus, publica expostulatione ipsius auctoritas infringeretur," "so that if it should seem to them (the δοκοῦσι) that Paul ought to be reprimanded, his influence might not be broken by the public complaint." But this also is not in accordance with the decided character of Paul; and if he had dreaded a *public expostulation*, he would not have ventured first to set forth his gospel *publicly*, because the apostles, in the event of disapproval, would not have been able to withhold *public* contradiction. The view that the private discussion with the δοκοῦσι *preceded* the general discussion with the church,[3] runs counter to the account of our passage, which represents the course of events as the converse. [See Note XXXII., p. 96.] — μήπως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον] Taken by itself, μήπως may signify either *lest possibly*, *ne forte*, and thus express directly the *design* of the ἀνεθέμην,[4] or *whether . . . not possibly*, *num forte*,[5] thus indirectly *interrogative*. The former interpretation is decidedly to be rejected, because the indicative aorist ἔδραμον does not suit it; for, according to the Greek use of the particles of design with the indicative aorist or imperfect,[6] the ἀνεθέμην would not actually have taken place; and besides this, we should have to assume—without any ground for doing so in the context—that τρέχω and ἔδραμον are said *ex aliorum judicio*,[7] "from the

---

[1] It is therefore a pure error, when τεσσάρων is sometimes styled a *varia lectio.*

[2] Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 361 ; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 97.

[3] As Baur and Zeller maintain.

[4] *De P. ep. ad Gal. trib. prim. capp.* Lips. 1832, also in his *Opusc.* V. p. 118 ff.

[5] *De aliquot N. T. locor. lectione et interpr.* 1833.

---

[1] Comp. Wesseling, *ad Herod.* ii. 151; Matthiae, p. 1359; Winer, p. 376.

[2] Comp. Eph. iii. 3.

[3] Comp. i. 12.

[4] Comp. Acts xxv. 14; 2 Macc. iii. 9, and Grimm thereon. Among Greek authors, in Plutarch, Polyb., Diog. L., etc.

[5] Bernhardy, p. 288; Winer, p. 587.

[6] Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Calvin, Koppe, Schott, Olshausen, and others.

[7] If αὐτοῖς applied to the apostles, there was no need for regarding (with Chrysostom and others) κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσι as a more precise definition of ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς; for if so, Paul would have expressed himself in a way very illogical and liable to misunderstanding, because κατ' ἰδίαν δέ would be without meaning, if it was not intended to denote some act *different* from the general ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς. Paul must have written simply ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ., ἀνεθέμην δὲ τοῖς δοκ. This remark applies also against the view of Baur and Zeller, who, although they allow that the language warrants our view, take the sense to be, "I set it forth to them, *but only to those of highest repute* in particular." On the contrary, if αὐτοῖς applied to the apostles, the meaning, as the passage runs, would have to be taken as Schott (comp. Olshausen) gives it: "doctrinam . . . apostolis omnibus exposui, privatim vero (uberius ac diligentius) iis, qui magni aestumantur, apostolis auctoritate insignibus, Petro, Johanni, Jacobo," "I set forth the doctrine to all, but in private more fully and assiduously to those who are regarded of high repute, viz., the apostles eminent in influence, Peter, John, James." But how improbable it is in itself, that Paul should have held such a separate conference with a select few of the apostles, and should not have vouchsafed an equally circumstantial and accurate exposition of his teaching to the whole of the apostles as such! Apart, however, from this, the three δοκοῦντες appear to have been the only apostles present in Jerusalem at that time.

[8] Winer, Matthies.

[9] In the *Revue théol.* 1859, p. 62 ff.

[10] Comp. i. 16.

[11] Usteri.

---

[1] Comp. Rom. xi. 13.

[2] On κατ' ἰδίαν, comp. Matt. xvii. 19 ; Mark iv. 34, ix. 28 ; Valckenaer, *ad Eur. Phoen.* p. 439. It is, like the ἰδίᾳ, more usual in the classical authors (Thuc. i. 132. 2, ii. 44. 2 ; Xen. *Mem.* iii. 7. 4, *Anab.* v. 7. 13, vi. 2. 13 ; Ast, *Lex. Plat.* II. p. 88), the contrast to κοινῇ or δημοσίᾳ (comp. Macc. iv. 5).

[3] Comp. ἄνδρας ἡγουμένους ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, Acts xv. 22.

[4] Grotius.

[5] Schwegler, I. p. 120.

[6] Cameron, Rückert, Schott, comp. Olshausen.

[7] See, on the contrary, Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 138 f.

[8] See Eur. *Hec.* 295, and thereon Schaefer and Pflugk ; Porphyr. *de abstin.* ii. 40, *et al.* ; Kypke, II. p. 274 ; Dissen, *ad Pind. Ol.* xiii. 56. Comp. also Clem. *Cor.* I. 57. Just so the Hebrew חָשַׁב. See Gesenius, *Thes.* I. p. 531 ; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 839 f. Comp. δόκιμοι, Plat. *Pol.* x. p. 618 A ; Herod. i. 65 ; Blomfield, *Gloss. in Aesch. Pers.* p. 109.

[9] Comp. Chrysostom.

---

[1] This was a case in which the principle beyond doubt applied, σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελειοῖς, 1 Cor. ii. 6.

[2] *Kirche im apost. Zeitalt.* p. 128. Comp. Lange, *apost. Zeitalt.* p. 100.

[3] So Neander, p. 277 [Am. Ed., p. 124]; Lekebusch, *Apostelgesch.* p. 295.

[4] So, following the Vulgate and the Greek Fathers, Erasmus, Luther, and most expositors, including Winer, Fritzsche, Rückert, Schott.

[5] Usteri, Hilgenfeld, Hofmann, Wieseler.

[6] See on iv. 17.

[7] Those who do not agree with this, fall into forced interpretations, as Fritzsche, *Opusc.* p. 175: "ne forte frustra *etiam tum*, *quum epistolam ad Galatas scriberet*, apostolus laboraret, aut . . . *ante iter* jam laboravisset," "lest, perhaps, it was in vain that the apostle labored even when he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians, or that he had already labored previously to the journey."

judgment of others," and that τρέχω is subjunctive, although by its connection with ἔδραμον it evidently proclaims itself indicative. Hence μήπως must be rendered *num forte*, and the reference of the *num* is supplied by the idea, "for consideration, for examination," included in ἀνεθέμην.[1] The passage is therefore to be explained: "*I laid before them my gospel to the Gentiles, with a view to their instituting an investigation of the question whether I am not possibly running or have run in vain.*" The apostle *himself, on his own part*, was in no uncertainty about this question, for he had obtained his gospel from revelation, and had already such rich experience to support him, that he certainly did not fear the downfall of his previous ministry;[2] hence μήπως is by no means to be understood[3] as implying any uncertainty or apprehension of his own (*in order to see*, in order to be certain, *whether*). But he wanted to obtain the judgment and declaration *of the church and the apostles.*[4] Observe, moreover, that the apostle does not say εἴπως (*whether possibly*); but, with the delicate tact of one who modestly and confidently submits himself to the judgment of the church and the apostles, while hostile doubts as to the salutary character of his labors are by no means unknown to him, he writes μήπως, *whether . . . not possibly* (iv. 11; 1 Thess. iii. 5), that is, in the positive sense, *whether perhaps.*[5] In no case has the apostle in μήπως κ.τ.λ. expressed the intention of procuring *for himself* a conviction of the correctness of his teaching.[6]— εἰς κενόν] *in cassum*, "in vain."[7] Paul conceives his running as *vain*, that is, not attaining the saving result aimed at,[8] if his gospel be not the right and true one. — τρέχω] a figurative expression, derived from the running in the *stadium*, for earnestly striving activity—in this case, official activity, as in Phil. ii. 16, 2 Tim. iv. 7.[1] The present indicative transfers us into the present time of the ἀνεθέμην, from which ἔδραμον then looks back into the past. A clear and vivid representation.[2]

---

[1] Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 137, 140.

[2] Holsten. Against Holsten's exaggeration Hilgenfeld (in his *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 117 f.) has justly declared himself. The counter remarks of Holsten, *z. Ev. d. Petr. u. Paul.* p. 277, are immaterial.

[3] With Usteri and Hilgenfeld, also Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 303, and Holsten.

[4] So, correctly, Wieseler; comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 44 f., who, however, *heil. Schr. N. T.* I. p. 86, supplies only ἀνεθέμην (*without* τὸ εὐαγγ. κ.τ.λ) after τ. δοκοῦσι, thus making μήπως κ.τ.λ. *the matter itself laid before them*; but this would be at variance with the essential idea of laying before them the *gospel*, of which Paul is speaking, for he does not repeat ἀνεθέμην, and that *alone*. According to Hofmann, the state of the case would amount to this, that Paul desired to have the answer to the question μήπως κ.τ.λ. from the δοκοῦσι only, and not also from the *church*,—a view which would neither harmonize with the position of the latter (comp. Acts xv. 22 f.), nor would leave apparent in the text any object for his submitting his gospel to the *church* at all.

[5] In μήπως κ.τ.λ., let us conceive to ourselves the moment when the apostle has laid his gospel before those assembled, and then says as it were, "Here you have my gospel to the Gentiles; by it you may now judge *whether I am perhaps laboring in vain*, or—if from the present I look back upon the past—*have so labored!*" The supposition of *irony* (Märcker in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 537) is not warrantable amidst the gravity of the whole surrounding circumstances.

[6] Winer (p. 470) justly lays stress upon this in opposition to Fritzsche, but is of opinion (with de Wette) that Paul desired to obviate the frustration involved in μήπως κ.τ.λ., by inducing the assent of the apostles to his gospel, "because without this assent and recognition the Christians who had been converted by him would have remained out of communion with the others" (de Wette). But this latter idea is unnecessarily introduced; and even in the event of non-recognition, Paul, looking to his direct calling and the revelation he had received, could not have regarded it as involving the result of his labor being in vain.

[7] See Jacobs *ad Anthol.* VII. p. 328. Comp. the passages from Josephus in Kypke; from the LXX., Isa. lxv. 23 *et al.*; from the N. T., 2 Cor. vi. 1, Phil. ii. 16, 1 Thess. iii. 5. Comp. also the use of εἰς κοινόν, εἰς καιρόν, εἰς καλόν, "in common, in season, in good time," and the like, in Bernhardy, p. 221.

[8] Comp. the classical ἀνόνητα πονεῖν, "to perform senseless labors," Plat. *Rep.* 486 C.

Note.—Acts xv. 4, 12 must not be adduced as proof either for or against (Fritzsche, Wieseler, and others) the identity of our journey with that of Acts xv. The two facts—that related in Acts xv. 4, 12, and that expressed by ἀνεθέμην κ.τ.λ. in Gal. ii. 2—are two *different* actions, both of which took place at that visit of the apostle to Jerusalem, although what is stated in our passage was foreign to the historical connection in Acts xv., and therefore is not recorded there. The book of Acts relates only *the transactions conducive to his object, in which Paul took part as deputy from the church of Antioch.* What he did besides in the personal interest of his apostolic validity and ministry, -namely, his laying his gospel as well before the church (not to be identified with the assembly of the council) as before the δοκοῦντες also separately, -forms the subject of his narrative in Gal. ii., which is related to that in the Acts, not as excluding it and thereby impugning its historical character, but as supplementing it (contrary to the view of Baur, Schwegler, Zeller, Hilgenfeld). Comp. on Acts xv. 19 f. As to the non-mention of the apostolic decree, see Introd. § 3.

Ver. 3. Observe, that Paul does not pass on to the result of his discussions with the δοκοῦσι until ver. 6, and consequently it is ver. 6 ff. which corresponds to the κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ δοκοῦσι in ver. 2; so that vv. 3-5 have reference to the result of the laying his gospel to the Gentiles before *the Christians in Jerusalem generally*, and correspond with the first part of ver. 2 (ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγ. ὃ κηρ. ἐν τ. ἔθν.). — *But* so little had that exposition of my gospel to the church at Jerusalem a result counteracting it and implying the εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον, that, on the contrary, *not even Titus*, etc. Thus ἀλλ' οὐδέ[3] introduces a fact which—in contrast to the idea of "running in vain," which had just been brought forward as the point for inquiry in that exposition of his gospel—serves as the surest palpable proof how triumphantly the Gentile gospel of the apostle (which rejected the necessity of circumcision for the Hellenes) maintained its ground then before the church of Jerusalem, and how very far people were from ascribing to the apostle a running, or having run, in vain. For otherwise it would have been absurd, if the church had not pleaded for, and accomplished, the circumcision at least of Titus.[4] "But not even this was done, to say nothing of its being a duty of the church to reject my gospel, which was altogether opposed to the circumcision of Gentiles, and to decide that I εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον!" This line of argument involves a *syllogism*, of which ἀλλ' οὐδὲ

---

[1] In other passages, Christian activity in general, as 1 Cor. ix. 24 f., Gal. v. 7, Heb. xii. 1. Comp. Rom. ix. 16.

[2] As to the indicative generally with the indirect interrogative μή, *whether not*, see Bernhardy, p. 397; Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 810; also Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 104.

[3] Comp. Luke xxiii. 15; Acts xix. 2.

[4] The latter, *as associated with the apostle in teaching*, must, in his uncircumcised Gentile condition, have been *specially* offensive to those who had Judaistic views.

. . . *περιτμηθῆναι* is the *minor.* — *Ἕλλην ὢν*] Although a *Hellene*, a *Gentile.*[1] We have no further details as to his descent. — *ἠναγκάσθη*] From vv. 4, 5 it follows that, on the part of certain Christians at Jerusalem (not of the apostles also, who are not referred to until ver. 6, where the *κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκ.* is resumed), the circumcision of Titus had been *urged*, but had not been *complied with* on the part of Paul, Barnabas, and Titus, and this resistance was respected by the church;[2] hence the *οὐκ ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι*, *there was not imposed on him the necessity of submitting to be circumcised.* Most expositors, however, adopt the common opinion that *οὐδὲ . . . ἠναγκάσθη περιτ.* implies that the circumcision of Titus *had not been demanded*, which is adduced by Paul as a proof of his agreement with the apostles.[3] This view is decisively set aside by the sequel (see on ver. 4), apart from the fact that here the relation to the *apostles* is not yet under discussion. Moreover, if the circumcision of Titus had not been demanded, there would have been no occasion for the expression *ἠναγκάσθη*. Certain individuals in the church, no doubt instigated by the false brethren (ver. 4), had really come forward with the demand that Titus must submit to be circumcised.[4] To look upon the false brethren themselves as those who demanded the circumcision of Titus[5] does not suit ver. 4, in which they appear only as the *more remote* cause of the demand; they kept *in the background.*[6]

Note.—An inconsistency with Acts xv., in which the argument and decision are *against* the necessity of circumcision, would only emerge in ver. 3, if the matter in question here had been the principal transactions of the *council itself*, and if those who required the circumcision of Titus had been the *apostles* (or had at least *included* the apostles), as Fritzsche, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Holsten, and others assume. But as neither of these is the case, and as, indeed, it does not even follow from our passage that the apostles had so much as merely *advised* the circumcision of Titus (Wieseler's earlier opinion, which he has now rightly abandoned), this passage cannot furnish arguments either against the identity of the journey Gal. ii. with that of Acts xv. (Fritzsche, p. 224), or against the historical character of Acts xv. (Baur and his followers).

Ver. 4 f. The motive, *why* the demand of circumcision made as to Titus was not complied with by Paul, Barnabas, and Titus (comp. *εἴξαμεν*, ver. 5). It was refused *on account of the false brethren*, to whom concession would otherwise have been made in a way conducive to their designs against Christian liberty.—*διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους*] *sc. οὐκ ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι.*[1] These words, however, are not, properly speaking, *to be supplied ;* in *διὰ δὲ τ. π. ψ.* they receive their more precise definition, made specially prominent by *δέ*, *autem : on account, however, of the false brethren.* Though Paul might have subjoined this immediately without *δέ*, he inserts the *δέ* not superfluously,[2] but on account of the important bearing of the matter on his argument. The case is similar when a more precise definition is made prominent by *δέ*, the same word being repeated, as in ver. 2.[3] On *δέ* Bengel justly remarks, "declarat et intendit," "he declares and intends," as in fact *δέ* is often used by classical authors for giving prominence to an explanatory addition in which the previous verb is of course again understood.[4] As to the matter itself, observe how Paul under other circumstances, where there was no dogmatic requirement of opponents brought into play, could bring himself to allow circumcision ; see Acts xvi. 3. Consequently after ver. 3 a comma only is to be placed, not a full stop, or even a colon.[5] Others[6] supply *ἀνέβην*, which, however, after ver. 3, could not possibly occur to the mind of a reader.[7] Rinck[8] assumes an *anacoluthon*,—that *οὐκ εἴξαμεν* was intended to follow on *διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτ. ψευδαδέλφ.*, but that Paul had been led off by the long parenthesis and had then added *οἷς*. Buttmann[9] leaves the choice to be made between this view and ours. But if Paul had intended to write, *on account of the false brethren we have not yielded*, he would not in doing so have represented the false brethren as those *to whom* he had not yielded ; by using *οἷς* he would thus have *altered*[10] the sense of what he had begun to say, and would simply have occasioned perplexity by the mixture of *an account of* and *to whom.* But there is no need to resort at all to an anacoluthon when, as here, what immediately precedes presents itself to complete the sense. This remark holds good also against Winer, p. 529, who[1] assumes that Paul mixed up the two thoughts : "We did not have Titus circumcised on account of the false brethren ;" and, "I might nowise yield to the false brethren." Hofmann[2] also produces an unnecessary anacoluthic derangement of the sentence, by supposing that a new sentence begins with *διὰ δὲ παρεισάκτ. ψευδ.*, but that the relative definition *οἵτινες κ.τ.λ.* does not allow it to be completed ; that, in fact, this completion does not take place *at all*, but with ver. 6 a new period is begun, attached to what immediately precedes. Following the example of Tertullian, *c. Marc.* v. 8, Ambrose, Pelagius, and Primsius (opposed by Jerome), Rückert, followed by Elwert, supplements the passage as follows : "But on account of the false brethren *I withal allowed Titus to be circumcised*" (consequently *περιετμήθη*). According to his view, this is the course of thought in the passage : "Even Titus was at that time *not forced* to be circumcised ; there was not, and could not be, any question of *compulsion ;* but because I saw that there were false brethren, whose sole endeavor was to discover a vulnerable point in us, I considered it advisable to give them no occasion (?), and had Titus circumcised. *Nevertheless, to yield out of obedience* to them, and to acknowledge a necessity in respect to all Gentiles, never occurred to me for a moment," etc. Against this view it may be decisively urged, first, that in ver. 3 the emphasis is laid on *Τίτος* and not on *ἠναγκάσθη*, and in ver. 5 on *πρὸς ὥραν* and not on *τῇ ὑποταγῇ* ; secondly, that the idea of "acknowledging a necessity in respect to all Gentile Christians" is not even hinted at by any word of Paul ; and thirdly, the general consideration that a point so important and so debatable as the (alleged) permission of the circumcision of Titus would have been, would have needed, especially before the *Galatians* (comp. v. 2), a very different elucidation and vindication from one so enigmatically involved, in which the chief ideas could only be read between the lines. But such a compliance itself shown towards *false* brethren,—not for the sake, possibly, of some *weak* brethren, who are imported into the case by Elwert, nor on account of the *Jews*, as in the circumcision of Timothy (Acts xvi. 3),—would have been quite unprincipled and wrong. Very near to the interpretation of Rückert comes that of Reiche, who places the (supposed) circumcision of Titus not at the time then being and at Jerusalem, but at an earlier period, at which it took place either in Antioch or elsewhere.[3] But against

---

[1] This "*although a Hellene*" refers to ὁ σὺν ἐμοί. Paul is conscious of the *boldness*, nay, of the *defiance* (comp. Jerome on ver. 1, "*ausus sit*"), which was involved in bringing the *Hellene* with him to the council at *Jerusalem*, the seat of Judaism. In the sense of *my official colleague* (Reiche, Wieseler), the simple ὁ σὺν ἐμοί is not in harmony with the context.

[2] For the ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι, if it had occurred, *could* only have occurred through the church—and indeed possibly even the apostolic college (as the Tübingen criticism asserts)—joining in the demand made on Titus, and adopting it as their own.

[3] See Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and many others, including Winer, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, de Wette, Hofmann, Sieffert.

[4] Comp. the subsequent case of Timothy, who, under different circumstances, was circumcised by Paul himself (Acts xvi. 3).

[5] Bleek, Wieseler, and others.

[6] Holsten wrongly reverses the relation, when he holds that behind the false brethren Paul saw the Christians of Jerusalem and the δοκοῦντες.

---

[1] To supply merely *ἠναγκάσθη περιτμ.* *without οὐκ* (Koppe), so that *ἠναγκάσθη* is to be understood in the altered sense, "But on account of the false brethren, *it was insisted on in this case*," is entirely inadmissible, both on account of this very diversity of sense, and also because in ver. 3 the negation is essential and indeed the chief point.

[2] Jerome, Theodoret, Theophylact.

[3] So, in substance, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Augustine, Camerarius, Erasmus, Castalio, Piscator, Bos, Calovius, Estius, Bengel, and others : more recently, Schott, Fritzsche, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ellicott, Reithmayr ; also Matthies, who, however, so explains the passage that we should rather expect it to run, *διὰ δὲ τῶν παρεισάκτων ψευδαδέλφων*.

[4] Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 359.

[5] Lachmann, Tischendorf.

[6] As Zachariae, Storr, Borger, Flatt, Hermann, Matthias.

[7] Olshausen takes a similar but still more harsh and arbitrary view, that the idea in Paul's mind was, "I went indeed up to Jerusalem, in order to lay my gospel before the apostles (?) for examination ; on account of these, however, it was really not at all necessary . . . but, on account of the false brethren, I found myself induced to take steps." In the ardor of his language, Paul had allowed himself to be diverted from the construction he had begun ; and described instead the nature of the false teachers.

[8] *Lucubr. crit.* p. 170 f. (so previously Grotius, and recently Wieseler).

[9] *Neut. Gr.* p. 329 f.

[10] Wieseler seeks to avoid this by taking *διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισ. ψευδαδ.* as equivalent to *τῶν δὲ ψευδαδέλφων κελευόντων τοῦτο*, "the false brethren demanding this :" *with their demand* Paul had not exhibited compliance. But *διά* means nothing else than *an account of*, that is, according to the context, *with reference to them* (comp. Acts xvi. 3), namely, because they lurked in the background in the matter, and it was inexpedient to take account of their designs or to give them any free scope. Also in Heb. ii. 10, vi. 7, John vi. 57, *διά* with the accus. is simply *on account of*, and has to receive its more precise meaning from the context. In the passages quoted by Wieseler (Xen. *Cyr.* v. 2. 35, and Plut. *Cam.* 35), *διά*, according to the

---

well-known Greek usage, is "*for the sake of*," that is, *through merit* or *through fault* of any one.

[1] Comp. Hilgenfeld.

[2] Comp. his *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 46.

[3] *At vero* . . . ut rem aliam hic interponam, vv. 3–6 (nam ver. 6 oratio ad apostolos redit), Titi nimirum circumcisionem, quam quis forte modo dictis ver. 2 opponat, quasi apostolorum aliorumve auctoritate vel jussu fecerim, aut ipse circumcisionem legisque observationem necessariam duxerim 6 f. parum mihi constans, sufficiat monuisse :—*nec Titus ille comes meus et adjutor, Graecus natus, minime est coactus circumcidi* a me vel a quocunque ; *propter falsos autem fratres, qui tum nos speculabantur*, quomodo immunitate a lege Mos. a Christo nobis parta uteremur, eo consilio, *ut denuo nos sub legis servitium redigerent* . . . *propter hos* dico

this view may be urged partly the arguments already used against Rückert, and in addition the arbitrary procedure involved in shifting vv. 3–6 to an earlier time ; although *Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοί*, evidently referring back to *συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον* in ver. 1, precludes our taking this event out of the course of the narrative begun in ver. 1. Moreover, *περιετμήθη* as supplied by Reiche cannot be invested with the sense "*liber et volens* circumcisionem suscepit," "freely and voluntarily received circumcision,"—a sense which, for the very sake of the contrast, since the emphasis lies on *liber et volens*, would need to be *expressed* (by *ἐθελοντὴν περιετμήθη* or the like). Lastly, an un-Pauline compliance[1] would be the result of *the* sense which would follow from the omission of *οἷς οὐδέ* in ver. 5 (see the critical notes) : "But on account of the false brethren . . . I gave way momentarily and caused Titus to be circumcised," to which also the sentence of purpose which follows, *ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια κ.τ.λ.*, would be utterly unsuitable ; for, *according to the point of view of our epistle*, the "truth of the gospel" could only continue with the Galatians if such a compliance did *not* take place. — *παρεισάκτους*] *subintroductos* (Vulgate), *brought in by the side*, that is, *privily and illegitimately*,—namely, into the association of Christian brotherhood, of which they are not at all true members.[2] The word does not occur elsewhere in ancient authors ;[3] but it must have been employed on several occasions, as *παρείσακτον* is quoted by Hesychius, Photius, Suidas, and *παρεισάκτους* by Zonaras, being explained by *ἀλλότριον* and *ἀλλοτρίους*, "pertaining to another and to others." The word has also been preserved as a *name* (by-name) in Strabo, xvii. 1, p. 794, *Παρείσακτος ἐπικληθεὶς Πτολεμαῖος*. The verb *παρεισάγω* is very current in later authors.[4] — *ψευδαδέλφους*] as in 2 Cor. xi. 26, persons who were Christians indeed, but were not so according to the true nature of Christianity—from the apostle's standpoint, anti-Pauline, Judaizing reactionaries against Christian freedom. The *article* points out that these people were historically known to the readers, Acts xv. 1, 5. — *οἵτινες κ.τ.λ.*]

Titus ritum hunc externum . . . suscepit volens, ut istis calumniandi nocendique ansa et materies praeripiatur," etc., "But to interpose here another subject, vv. 3–6 (for in v. 6 the argument returns to the apostles), forsooth, the circumcision of Titus, which some one perhaps opposes to what has just been said, v. 2, as though with little consistency I did this by the influence or command of the other apostles, it is sufficient to have taught : Neither was Titus, my companion and assistant, born a Greek, in any way compelled to be circumcised either by me or by any one ; but because of false brethren who were then spying us out, as to how we were employing the immunity from the law of Moses, acquired for us by Christ, that they might anew bring us under bondage to the law—because of these, I say, Titus voluntarily underwent this rite, that the occasion and material of calumniating and injuring *us* might be taken away from them, etc."

[1] Reiche seeks to evade this by thus explaining ver. 5: "*quibus*, quanquam prudentiae fuerit, propter eos Titum circumcidere, attamen ceterum, in rebus ad fidem libertatemque Christianam fere facientibus, *ne paulisper quidem cessimus iis obtemperantes*," "Although it would have been the part of prudence to circumcise Titus because of them, yet in matters generally pertaining to Christian faith and liberty, we yielded by obeying them, not even for a little." We should thus have in ver. 5 a saving clause, *the most essential* point of which ("*ceterum, in rebus*," etc., "but, in things," etc.) would *have to be mentally supplied.*

[2] See the note after ver. 5.

[3] *Prol. Sir.* in Biel, III. p. 43, and Schleusner, IV. p. 228, πρόλογος παρείσακτος ἀδήλου.

[4] Plut. *Mor.* p. 328 D ; Polyb. ii. 7. 8, vi. 56. 12 ; Diod. xii. 41 ; 2 Pet. ii. 1. Comp. παρεισέδυσαν, Jude 4.

quippe qui, "since they," contains the explanation as to the *dangerous character* of these persons, by which the διὰ δὲ τ. π. ψ. is justified. — παρεισῆλθον].[1] The idea of *being smuggled in* (which is denied by Hofmann) is here accordant with the context, and indicated purposely by the twice-repeated παρεις.[2] — κατασκοπῆσαι] *in order to spy out*, hostilely to *reconnoitre*, to watch.[3] — ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησ.] a more precise definition of the preceding ἡμῶν.[4] This freedom is, as may be gathered from the entire context, nothing else than the *freedom from Mosaism* (Rom. x. 4) through justification by faith.[5] Matthies introduces also the *Christian life*, but without warrant; the spying of the pseudo-Christians was directed to the point, whether and to what extent the Christians did not conform to the enactments of the Mosaic law. Ἐν Χριστῷ implies as its basis the solemn idea of the ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι.[6] Hence: *in Christ*, as our element of life by means of faith,[7] *as Christians*. — ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν[8]] is the dangerous *design* which they had in view in their κατασκοπῆσαι. Ἡμᾶς applies, as before, to the *Christians* as such, not merely to Paul and Titus (Winer, de Wette), or to Paul and the Gentile Christians (Baur); for it must be the wider category of those to whom, as the *genus*, the ὑμεῖς in ver. 5 belongs as the *species*. We must also notice διαμείνῃ in ver. 5, which is correlative to the ἔχομεν in ver. 4. The *future* after ἵνα indicates, that the false brethren expected their success to be certain and enduring.[9] In classical authors we find only ὅπως, ὄφρα, and μή thus construed, and not ἵνα, as Brunck, *ad Eur. Bacch.* 1380, supposed,[10] but in the Hellenists and Fathers ἵνα also.[11] Κατά *strengthens* the idea of the *simple* verb: *to make us wholly slaves* (of Mosaism), *to enslave us*.[12] The mode in which the apostle looks at these people does not confound the result with the intention (de Wette); it represents the latter correctly according to the fact (they desire to bind the Christians to the law), but in the form which it assumed *from the Pauline point of view*.[1]

---

[1] Comp. Lucian, *Asin.* 15, εἰ λύκος παρεισέλθοι; Polyb. ii. 55. 3.

[2] Comp. generally on Rom. v. 20, and see Chrysostom on our passage.

[3] Comp. Josh. ii. 2, 3; 2 Sam. x. 3; 1 Chron. xix. 3; Eur. *Hel.* 1623; Polyb. x. 2; also κατάσκοπος, *a spy*.

[4] Comp. Eph. ii. 4 *et al.*

[5] Comp. iii. 13, v. 1.

[6] v. 6; 2 Cor. v. 21; Eph. iii. 6, *et al.* Comp. Eph. i. 7, iii. 12.

[7] Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 17.

[8] The *Recepta*, defended by Reiche, is καταδουλώσωνται. But B** F G, 17, Dam., have καταδουλώσωσιν; and A B* C D E ℵ, min., καταδουλώσουσιν (so Lachmann, Scholz, Tischendorf). The *middle* (to which, moreover, Lucian, *Soloec.* 12, assigns an unfounded difference from the active) is accordingly abandoned unanimously by the best MSS., and is the more readily to be given up, because in this case the versions cannot come into consideration, and consequently the importance of the MSS. is all the greater. The *middle* being most familiar from the LXX. (Gen. xlvii. 21; Ex. i. 14, vi. 5; Lev. xv. 46; Ezek. xxix. 18; the *active*, only in Jer. xv. 14, xvii. 4; the Apocrypha has the *middle* only), intruded itself unsought. This much in opposition to Reiche, who derives the active from 2 Cor. xi. 20. Further, as καταδουλώσουσιν has the great preponderance of testimony, and was very easily liable to the alteration into the subjunctive usual after ἵνα, it is to be adopted (with Usteri, Schott, Wieseler, Hofmann), but is not to be considered (with Fritzsche) as a corruption of the subjunctive. The *Recepta* καταδουλώσωνται, which K and most of the later MSS. have, shows that the change into the subjunctive must have been very prevalent at an early date. Nevertheless L and one min. have καταδουλώσονται, which must have sprung from the original καταδουλώσουσιν.

[9] See Matthiae, p. 1186; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 683, Rost, *ad Duncan. Lex.* p. 870.

[10] Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 629.

[11] Comp. Winer, p. 271; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 202.

[12] Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 20; Plat. *Pol.* i. p. 315 B, δουλοῦσθαι ἀδίκως καὶ καταδεδουλῶσθαι; Thuc. iii. 70. 2, and Duker *in loc.*

Ver. 5. *Connection:* — "*On account of the false brethren, however*, Titus was not compelled to be circumcised; *to these we did not yield even for an hour*. Had we consented to the suggestion, which was made to us by Christians at Jerusalem (see on ver. 3), at least to circumcise Titus, we should have thereby yielded to the false brethren standing in the background, who declared the circumcision of Gentile Christians to be necessary; but this did not at all take place."[2] — *οἷς*] in the sense of *τούτοις γάρ*, "for to these." See Stallbaum, *ad Phil.* p. 195 f.; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 1. 64; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 371. — *πρὸς ὥραν*] not even *for an hour*, indicating a very short duration of time. Comp. 2 Cor. vii. 8; Philem. 15; John v. 35; 1 Thess. ii. 17; also *πρὸς μίαν ῥοπήν*, "in one moment," Wisd. xviii. 12; *πρὸς ὀλίγον, πρὸς βραχύ*, and the like. — *εἴξαμεν*] namely, I and Barnabas and Titus. — *τῇ ὑποταγῇ*] belongs not to *διαμείνῃ* (Matthias), an inverted arrangement which would be without motive, but to *εἴξαμεν*, beside which it stands: "through the obedience claimed by the false brethren," that is, *by rendering to them the obedience which they desired.* On the matter itself, see Acts xv. 1, 5. Matthies regards *τῇ ὑποταγῇ* as an appositional explanation of *οἷς*.[3] But the yielding takes place not to the obedience, but to the demand (*τῇ ἐντολῇ*). Fritzsche correctly takes it in an ablative sense, but explains, "eo obsequio praestito, *quod apostoli postularent*," "such obedience being afforded as the apostles demanded." But in combination with *οἷς* . . . *εἴξαμεν*, and with *ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλ.* preceding, it would not occur to the reader to think of anything else than the obedience claimed *by* the *ψευδάδλφοι*. Besides, it was not the apostles at all who demanded the circumcision of Titus, but (see on ver. 3) Christians at Jerusalem, acting on the instigation of the *ψευδάδελφοι*, so that *these latter* would have been obeyed by the circumcision in question. Comp. the state of matters at Acts xxi. 21. Holsten, without any indication of support in the context, interprets: "by the *subordination to the δοκοῦντες*, which had been demanded by the false brethren." Lastly, Hermann (who is followed by Bretschneider), entirely in opposition to the context, explains it, "quibus ne horae quidem spatium *Jesu obsequio* segnior fui," "than whom I was more slow *in* obedience to Jesus not even for the space of an hour. — *ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια κ.τ.λ.*] *Object* of this non-compliance at that time, which, although in the nature of the case it concerned Pauline Christians generally, is represented concretely as referring to the *Galatians*: "*in order that the truth of the gospel may abide with you;* in order that by our conduct the principle of Christian freedom should not be shaken, and ye should not be induced to deviate from the truth, which forms the subject-matter of the gospel (ver. 14; Col. i. 5), by mixing it up with Mosaism" (comp. *ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον*, i. 6). A purpose, therefore—and this the readers were intended to feel—to which their present apostasy entirely ran counter!—πρὸς ὑμᾶς] as πρὸς αὐτόν, i. 18, comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 7; here also it is not the *with* of simple rest, but expresses the relation of an active bearing on life; Bernhardy, p. 265. Besides, Paul might justly say πρὸς ὑμᾶς, as the Galatians were for the most part *Gentile Christians*, and in that opposition to the false brethren it was the freedom of the Gentile Christians which he sought to maintain. The ὑμᾶς individualizes the readers of the letter (iii. 26, iv. 6; Col. i. 25; Eph. iii. 2, and frequently). The reference to the yet *unconverted* Gentiles, whom the truth of the gospel had still to *reach* (πρὸς ὑμᾶς), as suggested by Hofmann,[1] is in complete opposition to the text.—διαμείνη] *permaneret*, "might continue;" denoting the *abiding* continuance. The truth which they have received was not again to be lost. Heb. i. 11; 2 Pet. iii. 4; Luke xxii. 8; and frequently in Greek authors.

---

[1] Comp. vi. 12 f.

[2] Paul was therefore by no means "*nearly* compelled to have Titus circumcised" (Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 121).

[3] As to this usage, see Fritzsche, *Diss. in 2 Cor.* II. p. 135 f.

Note.—As by the ψευδάδελφοι (vv. 4, 5) cannot be meant the Judaizers at work *among the Galatians* (which is assumed by Fritzsche entirely in opposition to the connection), but only the same persons mentioned in Acts xv. 1, 5; they cannot be described as *false* brethren in relation to any *one particular church* (*e.g.* to *the church of Antioch*, into which they had crept *from Jerusalem*, as Baur and Reiche think). On the contrary, the general form of their antagonism, vv. 4, 5, as well as the further account in vv. 7–10, and the whole argument of the epistle, admit only of one point of view,—that the apostle, out of the certainty of the ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, styles them false brethren *in relation to Christianity generally*, of which they had, as regards their Judaizing character and action looked at from a Pauline standpoint, falsely pretended to be professors. This does not in itself exclude the fact that they had come from Jerusalem to Antioch (Acts xv. 1). The inflexible opposition offered to them by the apostle in Jerusalem doubtless contributed much to the bringing about of the apostolic decree. Comp. Märcker, *l.c.* p. 539. [See Note XXXIII., p. 96.]

Ver. 6. Paul having described in vv. 3–5 the momentous result of his relations towards the Christians in Jerusalem (αὐτοῖς, ver. 2), now passes on (corresponding to the κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσι, ver. 2) to *his relations towards the apostles*, explaining that the same result had then followed his discussions *with them*. — *The construction is anacoluthic.* For when the apostle wrote ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι, he intended subsequently to finish his sentence with οὐδὲν ἔλαβον, οὐδὲν ἐδιδάχθην, "I received nothing, I was taught nothing," or something of that kind; but by the intervening remarks ὁποῖοί ποτε . . . λαμβάνει he was completely diverted from the plan which he had begun, so that now the thought which floated before his mind in ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι is no longer brought into connection with these words, but is annexed in the form of a ground (γάρ) to πρόσωπον Θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει; and this altered chain of thought occasions ἐμοί to be now placed emphatically at the beginning. Properly speaking, therefore, we have here a parenthesis beginning with ὁποῖοι, which, without any formal conclusion, carries us back again by ἐμοὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ. to the main thought, leaving the words ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι entirely unconnected, and merely pointing back by means of *οἱ δοκοῦντες*, as by a guide-post, to that abandoned commencement of the sentence. For it is only in substance, and not in form, that the parenthesis is concluded with *λαμβάνει*. Comp. Rom. v. 12 ff. ; Eph. ii. 1 ff. An anacoluthon is also assumed by Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Piscator, Cornelius à Lapide, Grotius, Estius, Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Winer, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Eadie, and others ; so that—according to the usual view (Wieseler takes the correct one)—with *ἐμοὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.* Paul again takes up the thread of the discourse which had broken off with *ἀπὸ δὲ δοκούντων εἶναί τι*, and merely continues it *actively* instead of *passively* (Winer, p. 529). But this is opposed both by *ἐμοί*, which logically would not be in its proper place at the head of the resumed sentence, and also by *γάρ*, which does not correspond to the mere *inquam*, "I say" (*οὖν, δέ*), after parentheses, but in the passages concerned[1] is to be taken as explaining or assigning a reason. Hermann makes out an *aposiopesis*, so that *quid metuerem?* "what was I to fear?" has to be supplied after *ἀπὸ . . . εἶναί τι*.[2] But this is not suggested by the context, nor is it permitted by the tranquil flow of the discourse, in which no such emotion as warrants an *aposiopesis* is discoverable. Fritzsche supplies the very same thing which in ver. 4 was to be supplied after *ψευδαδέλφους*, making Paul say, "*a viris autem* (nempe), qui *auctoritate valerent* [circumcisionis necessitatem sibi imponi non sivit]," "but by the men who had influence [he did not allow the necessity of circumcision to be imposed on himself]." But however easy and natural this supplement was in ver. 4 after *ψευδαδέλφους*, because it was suggested as a matter of course by the words immediately preceding, in the present case it appears both harsh and involved, as the whole body of ideas in vv. 4, 5 intervenes and hinders the reader from going back to that supplement. And how abrupt would be the position of the following *ὁποῖοι κ.τ.λ.*! Lastly, the (erroneous) idea, that the *apostles* had demanded the circumcision of Titus, is thus violently imported into the text. Holsten's involved construction[3]—according to which *ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκ. κ.τ.λ.* is to be carried on to ver. 9 in conformity with the notion of *δεξιὰς λαμβάνειν ἀπό*—is shown by *ἐμοὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.*, where the *δοκοῦντες* already reappear, to be an impossible solution of the anacoluthon, which even thus is not avoided. The passage is explained without supposing either supplement or anacoluthon :—1. Most simply, and without violence to the language, by Burk,[4] making *εἶναί τι* belong to *οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει* : "That *on the part of those in authority* (by their recognition) I *am something* (namely, as respects my outward position), I reckon of no value." But, in reality, Paul attached to his recognition by the original apostles the true and great value which it necessarily had for him in confronting his opponents ; and hence he very carefully relates it in ver. 7. This interpretation therefore runs counter to the context.[5] 2. Just as little allowable is it[1] to connect ἀπο δὲ τ. δοκ. ἐ. τ. with the words preceding, "*but certainly* (this enduring confirmation of Christian freedom was only possible) *through the authority* of the δοκοῦντες εἶναί τι." But to the signification of ἀπό, *from the side of*, a sense would thus be arbitrarily ascribed, which is not justified by passages such as Matt. xvi. 21, and must have been expressed by some such explanatory addition as in Acts ii. 22. It was impossible also for Paul—above all in *this* epistle—to conceive the maintenance of the truth of his Gentile gospel as conditional on the authority of the original apostles. Lastly, instead of the sentence which next follows asyndetically (ὁποῖοι κ.τ.λ.), we should expect an emphasized antithesis (such as ἀλλ' ὁποῖοι κ.τ.λ.). 3. The Greek Fathers and Castalio, Calovius, Zachariae, Bolten, Borger, and others, interpret the passage, "*But as regards those of repute, it is one and the same thing to me*," etc., by which, however, ἀπό is quite in violation of language interchanged with περί. So also Rückert,[2] who at the same time wishes to preserve for ἀπό its due signification ("on the part of any one, it makes no difference to me ; that is, what concerns him, is quite indifferent to me"), without authority, however, from any actual linguistic usage. 4. Following Homberg, Ewald understands it as if it stood τῶν δὲ δοκούντων . . . οὐδὲν διαφέρω, "*But compared with those* who, etc., however high they once stood, *I am in nothing inferior*." 5. Hofmann[3] brings ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι (ἀπό, *from the side of*) into regimen with ver. 9, and in such a manner that the three δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι in ver. 9 are supposed to form the subject of the period beginning with ἀπὸ κ.τ.λ. in ver. 6 ; but this mode of construction is decisively condemned by its very inherent monstrosity, with its parentheses inserted one within another ; and besides this, the repetition of οἱ δοκοῦντες in ver. 6 would be entirely without aim and simply perplexing, if the continuation of the construction as regards ἀπὸ δ. τ. δ. ε. τ. were still to follow, as is supposed by Hofmann. Nevertheless, Laurent[4] has agreed with the latter, but has at the same time arbitrarily removed from the disjointed construction ὁποῖοι . . . τοὐναντίον as a marginal note of the apostle,—another expedient, whereby ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον, so violently dealt with by Hofmann, finds the connection with ἰδόντες, which it evidently has (see below) dissevered. — On δοκεῖν εἶναί τι, which may mean either *to reckon oneself to be something great*, or *to be esteemed great by others* (so here), see Wetstein.[5] The same persons are meant who are referred to in ver. 2 by τοῖς δοκοῦσι. But the addition of τι εἶναι, and the ὁποῖοι κ.τ.λ. which follows, betray here a certain irritation in reference to the opponents, who would not concede to Paul an estimation equal to that given to the original apostles, as if εἶναί τι belonged *pre-eminently* to the latter. — ὁποῖοί ποτε ἦσαν] Now come the parenthetical remarks, on account of which Paul leaves his

---

[1] Comp. Windischmann.

---

[1] Also Rom. xv. 27 ; 1 Cor. ix. 19.

[2] Comp. Dav. Schulz, who believes that *quidnam tandem adversus me actum est?* "what pray was done against me?" is suppressed.

[3] *z. Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 273 f.

[4] In the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, p. 734 ff.

[5] Comp. also, against it, Märcker in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 532 ff.

---

[1] With Märcker.

[2] Comp Olshausen, who, however, assumes that in using ἀπό Paul had at first some other phrase in his mind, but that he afterwards inexactly followed it up with οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει. In all essential points Matthias agrees with Rückert, as does also Reithmayr, who improperly compares Xen. *Cyr*. iv. 1. 4.

[3] Comp. above, against Holsten.

[4] *neut. Stud*. p. 29 f.

[5] Comp. Plat. *Euthyd*. p. 303 C, τῶν πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν σεμνῶν δὴ καὶ δοκούντων τι εἶναι οὐδὲν ὑμῖν μέλει, "for the many men, both as well as for the revered and those seeming to be something, you have no concern."

ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκ. εἶναί τι standing alone, but which he introduces, lest the high estimation of those apostles—which in itself, according to the real (and by him undisputed) circumstances of the case, he by no means calls in question—should lead to the inference that he had needed instruction from them. Comp. the subsequent *ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκ. οὐδὲν προσανέθ.*, and the thought already floating before the apostle's mind in the anacoluthic *ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι* (see above). Wieseler affirms too generally, that "Paul desired to check the *over*valuing of the older apostles." The real state of the case is this : Paul, with all decision, in order to counterbalance that *δοκεῖν εἶναί τι* of those men of high standing which he does not dispute, throws into the scale his own independence of them. And the weight of this counterbalancing lies precisely in *ὁποῖοί ποτε ἦσαν*, so far as the latter belongs to *οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει*, and is not, as Hofmann will have it, an appendage to *τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι*. — The *ποτέ*, with a direct or indirect interrogative, is the strengthening *cunque* or *tandem* which occurs constantly in Greek authors,[1] although not elsewhere in the N. T.[2] *Whosoever they were*, in whatsoever high repute they stood[3] while I was then with them, *it is all the same to me.* Rückert makes *ὁποῖοι* mean, "whether high or low, apostles or what else ;" holding that Paul speaks intentionally in an indefinite way of these men in high repute, as if he did not exactly know that they were apostles (?), in order to give the less offence in what he said. How strange this would be ! for every reader knew whom he meant. And how unsuitable to his purpose ! for what Paul desires to tell, is the recognition he received *from the apostles.* Many refer *ὁποῖοίποτε ἦσαν* back to the *lifetime of Jesus*, when those apostles had been His trusted disciples : some taking *ποτέ* as *olim*;[4] and others, with us, as *cunque.*[5] But in the case of James (see on ver. 9) this reference would not be even historically applicable, or it would need at least to be applied to a different kind of relation (that of *kinship*).[6] And besides, there is nothing at all to indicate any such retrospective reference to that remote past ; the context points merely to the time of Paul's sojourn in Jerusalem. Hence also it must not, with others still, be referred to—what was quite foreign to the apostle's aim—the *pre-Christian* condition of the apostles, in which they had been *sinners*,[7] or *ἰδιῶται*, and *fishermen*,[8] *ποτέ* being likewise understood as *olim.*[9] — *οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει*] *matters to me nothing.*[10] — *πρόσωπον Θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει*] פְּנֵי אִישׁ

---

[1] Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 1.

[2] Comp. 2 Macc. xiv. 32 ; see also Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 615 f.

[3] Not : how *friendly* and *brotherly* they were towards me (Matthias), to which meaning *οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει* is far from suited.

[4] Vulgate, Jerome, Pelagius, Luther, Beza, and others, including Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Ewald.

[5] "Quiqui illi fuerunt, etiam si ab ipso Jesu instituti, perinde est," "Whoever they were, even though appointed by Jesus Himself, it is the same," Hermann ; comp. Winer.

[6] See Hilgenfeld.

[7] Estius ; comp. Augustine.

[8] Ambrose, Thomas, Cajetanus, Cornelius à Lapide, and others.

[9] It was entirely in opposition to the context, that Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Jerome referred it to the earlier *teaching* of the apostles ; taking Paul to say, that whether at an earlier date they had been Judaizers or not was to him a matter of indifference.

[10] See Schaefer, *ad Dion. Hal.* p. 294 ; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 394.

אֱלֹהִים לֹא נשֵׂא, an asyndetic, and thereby more forcible and weighty, statement of the reason for *οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει.*[1] נָשָׂא פָּנִים, *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν*, properly, *to accept the countenance of any one* (not to dismiss), is used in the O. T. both in a good (*to be inclined, or gracious, to any one*, Gen. xix. 21, xxxii. 21, *et al.*) and in a bad sense, implying a *favor and respect* which is *partial*, determined by personal considerations.[2] In the N. T. *it is used solely in this bad sense.*[3] The transposed *arrangement of the words* lays the *chief emphasis* upon *πρόσωπον*, and then by *Θεὸς ἀνθρώπου* makes us sensible of the *contrast* between the manner and dignity of the *divine* procedure and such partiality for *human* authority.[4] — *ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο*] *Proof*, not of his independence of the apostles generally, but specially for what he had just said, *πρόσωπον Θεὸς ἀνθρ. οὐ λαμβάνει*, *from personal experience.* Hence *ἐμοί* is emphatically placed first : "*for to me*, for my part—although others may have received instruction from them, *to me*—they have communicated nothing." Paul's idea therefore is, that if God had been partial, *He would not have placed him on such parity with the δοκοῦσι*, *that to him*, etc. Rückert, wrongly anticipating, says that the prefixed *ἐμοί* finds its antithesis in ver. 11 : "*to me* they have communicated nothing, etc. ; but indeed, when Peter came to Antioch, *I* was compelled to admonish *him.*" But in this case, at least ver. 11 must have begun with *ἐγὼ δὲ* or *ἀλλ' ἐγώ.* According to Wieseler, Paul in *ἐμοί* is thinking of "to me, the former *persecutor*," an idea gratuitously introduced. In Hofmann's view the antithesis is intended to be, that *not to him from the others* was anything submitted, but *the converse.*[5] But if this were so, Paul must have written *οὐ γὰρ ἐμοὶ κ.τ.λ.*, just as afterwards *ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον αὐτοὶ κ.τ.λ.*, in order to have given at least a bare indication of this alleged antithesis. — *οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο*] quite as in i. 16 (comp. also Hofmann): *they addressed no communications*[6] *to me*, namely, in order to instruct and advise me,—a sense which is here also demanded by the context ; see the sequel, and comp. i. 12. It is usually understood : *οὐδὲν προσέθηκαν, οὐδὲν διώρθωσαν*, "they added nothing ; they corrected nothing" (Chrysostom), "nihil illi praesumserunt iis *adjicere*, quae prius a Christo accepta docueram inter gentes," "they presumed to *add* nothing to those things which, having formerly received of Christ, I had taught among the Gentiles," Beza.[7] Comp. Wieseler, Märcker, and Hilgenfeld: "They submitted nothing in addition to that which had been submitted by me; they approved the gospel, which I am preaching among the Gentiles." But πρός expresses merely the *direction*, and not *insuper* (see on i. 16). Should ἀνατίθημι, however, be understood as *to impose*, πρός would certainly express the idea *novum* opus imponere (Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1. 8); as Rückert[1] explains it, "*they imposed on me no further obligations*," the observance of the law being the point principally alluded to.[2] But in opposition to this view, apart from the fact that it involves a quite needless departure from the signification of the same word in i. 16, the circumstance is decisive, that προσανατίθημι in the middle would necessarily mean "*suscipere* novum opus," "to *undertake* a new work," as Xen. *Mem. l.c.*, and not "*imponere* novum opus," "to *impose* a new work," even though the comparison of the apostle's obligation to a burden (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 16 f.) should appear sufficiently justified by the legal nature of the matters imposed. — οὐδέν] either the accusative of the object, or more strongly (comp. i. 16), *in no point*, in no respect whatever. The idea that a *revelation* is intended as the contents of προσαν. (Holsten), must be sought for in the context: it is not conveyed by the words *per se.*

---

[1] "*Dei* judicium sequebatur, Paulus," "Paul followed God's judgment," Bengel.

[2] Lev. xix. 15 ; Deut. x. 17, *et al.* ; Ecclus. iv. 27 ; 3 Esr. iv. 39.

[3] Matt. xxii. 16 ; Mark xii. 14 ; Luke xx. 21 ; Jude 16. Comp. Acts x. 34 ; Jas. ii. 9 ; Rom. ii. 11 ; Eph. vi. 9 ; Col. iii. 26 ; Jas. ii. 1.

[4] Comp. Hom. *Od.* xix. 363 f., ἦ σε περὶ Ζεὺς ἀνθρώπων ἤχθηρε θεουδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντα, "surely Zeus hated thee above all men, though thou hadst a God-fearing spirit."

[5] Comp. *τινές* in Chrysostom, and the Paraphrase of Erasmus.

[6] "Nihil contulerunt," Vulgate.

[7] As also Valla, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, Koppe, Morus, Borger, Flatt, Winer, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, and others, Baur arbitrarily (I. p. 141, ed. 2) brings in the thought, "They have brought forward nothing against me, wherein I should have had to acknowledge them in the right." Οὐδέν is made to mean, nothing *conclusive* and *convincing*—nothing whereby they would have confuted him and brought him over to their side (comp. Baur in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1849, p. 463). There is not the most remote allusion in the passage to any *conflict* between Paul and the original apostles ; on the contrary, it implies the complete understanding on

Ver. 7. Ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον] to be separated merely by a comma from the preceding, being still connected with γάρ. "To me they made communication of no kind whatever; but, on the contrary, when they had seen, etc., the three pillar-apostles concluded with me and Barnabas the apostolic alliance," etc. (ver. 9). Hofmann, to force a regimen for ἀπὸ τῶν δοκούντων in ver. 6, very arbitrarily tears asunder the clear and simple connection which the words obviously present, taking ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον by itself and dissevered from what follows, and supplementing the sense by the insertion, "They have not proposed anything to me, but *conversely, I to them.*"[3] But this strange ellipsis is a device utterly unprecedented.[4] — ἰδόντες] *after they had seen*, namely, from the way in which I κατ' ἰδίαν ἀνεθέμην τὸ εὐαγγ. ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, "privately communicated to them the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles" (ver. 2). Usteri, "from the blessed result of my preaching." So also Rosenmüller, Winer, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Holsten, Hofmann; Rückert, Schott, de Wette, Wieseler, mix the two views; and Fritzsche includes the previous labors of the apostle among the Gentiles, *e.g.*, in Tarsus and Antioch, among the grounds of knowledge. But nothing beyond what we have just given can be gathered from the context. Erasmus appropriately paraphrases, "ubi communicato cum illis evangelio meo perspexissent," "when they had perceived upon the communication of my

---

both sides, which was the result of the discussion. The *conflict* affected the members of the church who were stirred up by the ψευδάδελφοι and the false brethren themselves (vv. 3–5).

[1] So also Bretschneider and Lechler, p. 412.

[2] Comp. also Zeller, *Apostelgesch.* p. 235.

[3] Comp. on τοὐναντίον, 2 Cor. ii. 7, 1 Pet. iii. 9; very frequently (also τἀναντία) occurring in Greek authors (Schaefer, *ad Bos. Ell.* p. 297.

[4] Certainly the ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον was, for Hofmann at least, the most refractory part of the sentence, which had in some sort of way to be forcibly torn from its natural connection with ἰδόντες,—a connection justly unassailed by expositors. And he has managed it by the device of the above-mentioned ellipsis!

gospel with them."—*ὅτι πεπίστ. τ. εὐαγγ. τ. ἀκροβ. κ.τ.λ.*] The emphasis is laid on *καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτ.*, as ver. 8 shows. They saw that my having been divinely entrusted with the gospel for the Gentiles was just such (just as undoubted, true, direct, etc.), as was that of Peter for the Jews; consequently there could be no question of any *προσαναθεῖναι*, and nothing could follow but complete recognition (ver. 9). The construction[1] in the sense of *πεπίστευταί μοι τὸ εὐαγγ.* (as F G, 19*, 46** actually read) is regular; as to the perfect, used of the enduring subsistence of the act.[2] — *τῆς ἀκροβυστίας*] that is, *τῶν ἀκροβύστων*, "of the circumcised,"[3] the gospel which belonged to the uncircumcised, and was to be preached to them. — *καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομ.*] Thus Peter appears as the *representative* of the Jewish apostles, in accordance with his superiority among them.[4] The destination of Peter as an apostle to the Gentiles also[5] is not negatived, but *a potiori fit denominatio.* — That this passage relates not to *two different gospels*, but to the same gospel for *two different circles of recipients*, to whose peculiarities respectively the nature and mode of preaching required special adaptation, is obvious of itself, and is clear from vv. 8, 9. But the passage cannot be worse misunderstood than it has been by Baur,[6] according to whom there was a special gospel of the uncircumcision and a special gospel of the circumcision, differing in this respect, that the one maintained the necessity of circumcision, while the other allowed it to drop.[7]

Ver. 8. A parenthetic historical substantiation of the preceding *πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγ. τῆς ἀκροβ., καθῶς Πετρ. τῆς περιτ.*: *for He who has been efficacious for Peter as regards the apostleship to the circumcision, has also been efficacious for me as regards the Gentiles;* that is, "for God, who has wrought effectually[8] in order to make Peter the apostle to the Jews, has also wrought effectually for me, to make me an apostle to the Gentiles." The stress lies on *ἐνεργήσας* and *ἐνήργησε*: God [see Note XXXIV., p. 96] has been not inactive, but efficacious, etc. But that in *ὁ ἐνεργήσας* Paul did not refer to *Christ*,[9] is evident not only from passages such as 1 Cor. xii. 6, Phil. ii. 13, Col. i. 29, but also from the fact that he constantly considers his apostleship to be the gift of *God's* grace, bestowed upon him through the *mediation* of Christ (i. 1, 15; Rom. i. 5, xv. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 10; Eph. iii. 2, 7, *et al.*). — *Πέτρῳ* is the *dativus commodi*, "dative of advantage."[10] — *εἰς τὰ ἔθνη*] *in reference to*

---

[1] Comp. Rom. iii. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 17.

[2] See Winer, p. 255.

[3] Rom. ii. 26, iii. 30; Eph. ii. 11.

[4] Matt. xvi. 18; Acts ii. iii. iv. v. *et al.*

[5] Acts xv. 7; 1 Pet. i. 1.

[6] *Theol. Jahresbericht*, 1849, p. 548.

[7] Comp. Holsten, who discovers the distinctive feature of the Gentile gospel in the "*gnosis* of the death of the cross," in spite of 1 Cor. i. 23 f. In opposition to such a separation, see also Ritschl, *altkath. K.* p. 127 f.

[8] Namely, by communicating the requisite endowments, enlightenment, strengthening, and generally the whole equipment belonging thereto. It is not the divine action towards the *attainment* of the ἀποστολή (Vatablus, Schott, Fritzsche) that is meant, but the *making fit* for it; the *attainment* was indicated in ver. 7, and is substantiated in ver. 8 by the *further* divine action which had taken place. But neither are the *results* of the office, brought about by God's helpful operation, referred to (Winer, Usteri, Baur, de Wette, Hofmann), which would anticipate the sequel.

[9] Paulus, comp. Chrysostom.

[10] Comp. Prov. xxix. 12 (xxxi. 12), according to the usual reading, ἐνεργεῖ γὰρ τῷ ἀνδρὶ εἰς ἀγαθά.

the Gentiles. The precise sense follows from the first half of the verse, namely, εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν. The well-known *comparatio compendiaria*, "compendious comparison."[1] There is therefore the less reason for assuming that Paul desired to *avoid* the expression εἰς ἀποστ. τ. ἐθνων.[2] Observe, however, how Paul places himself *on a par* with Peter; "perfecta auctoritas in praedicatione gentium," "perfect authority in preaching to the Gentiles," Ambrosiaster.

Ver. 9. Καὶ γνόντες] is connected, after the parenthesis, with ἰδόντες κ.τ.λ. in ver. 7.[3] — τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι] is not arbitrarily to be limited either to the *apostolic office*,[4] or to the success of the same;[5] but is to be left quite general: *the grace which had been given me.* They recognized *that Paul was highly gifted with grace*, and was—by the fact that God had so distinguished him by means of His grace and thereby legitimized him as His apostle—fully fitted and worthy to enter into the bond of collegiate fellowship with them. His apostolic mission, his apostolic endowments, the blessed results of his labor, are all included in the χάρις which they recognized,—a general term which embraces everything that presented itself in him as divinely-bestowed grace and working on behalf of his office. — Ἰάκωβος] the same as in i. 19; not the brother of John (Augustine), who at that time had been long dead (Acts xii. 2); also not the son of Alphaeus;[6] but *the brother of the Lord*, as is obvious of itself after what has been remarked on i. 19.[7] The mention of his name here *before* the other two is not in compliance with the view of the false teachers,[8] but is quite in due form, as the apostle is relating an official act *done in Jerusalem*, *where* James stood at the head of the church.[9] There is a certain *decorum* in this—the tact of a respectful consideration towards the mother-church and its highly-esteemed representative, who, as the Lord's actual brother, sustained a more peculiar and unique relation to Him than any of the twelve. The higher rank possessed by Peter and the apostles proper generally *as such*, is surely sufficiently established by i. 18 f. But James, just as the brother of the Lord, had already attained a certain archiepiscopal position in the *Jewish-Christian mother-church*, and consequently for Jewish Christianity generally, agreeably to the monarchic principle which was involved in the latter. If James had been precisely one of the twelve, Paul would *not*[10] have given him precedence over Peter; for, as mouthpiece of the twelve, Peter was the first for Jerusalem also and for the whole of the Jewish Christians.[11] The precedence, however, finds its explanation and its justification solely in the *unique* personal relation to Christ,—which belonged to none of the apostles. James, as the eldest of the brethren of the Lord,[1] was, as it were, his legitimate hereditary successor κατὰ σάρκα, "as to the flesh," in Israel. — οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι] *who pass* (not *passed*, see vv. 2, 6) *as pillars*, namely, of the Christian body, the continued existence of which, so far as it was conditioned by human agency (for Christ is the foundation), depended chiefly on them. The metaphor[2] is current in all languages.[3] Looking at the *frequent use* of the figure, it cannot be maintained that Paul here thought of the body of Christians exactly as *a temple*,[4] although he certainly regarded it as οἰκοδομή, "building."[5] These δοκοῦντες στῦλοι[6] εἶναι, according to their high repute now, when the decisive final result is brought forward, designated *with solemn precision* and mentioned *by name*, are the *very same* who were characterized in ver. 2 as οἱ δοκοῦντες, and in ver. 6 as δοκοῦντες εἶναί τι, as is evident from the uniform term οἱ δοκοῦντες being used three times. Hofmann nevertheless understands the expression in vv. 2 and 6 *more generally*, so that what the three δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι did is supposed to be designated *as that which was done for the sake of the false brethren on the part of those standing in special repute;* but this view is based on the misinterpretation, by which an awkward grammatical connection with ver. 9 is forced upon the anacoluthic ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων in ver. 6, and at the same time—in the interest of harmonizing (with Acts xv.)—a position in relation to the older apostles, unwarranted by the text, is invented to explain the notice διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτ. ψευδαδέλφ. in ver. 4. — δεξιὰς . . . κοινωνίας] On the separation of the genitive from its governing noun (in this case, because the following clause of purpose, ἵνα ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ., gives the explanation of κοινωνίας), see Winer, p. 179 f.; Kühner, § 865. 1; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 330 f. Both words are *without the article*, because δεξιάς did not require it;[7] and in κοινωνίας the *qualitative* element is to be made prominent: *right hands of fellowship.* For the giving of the right hand is the symbol of *alliance.*[8] In opposition to the idea of an *alliance* being concluded, the objection must not be made[9] that the act took place on the part of the apostles only; for, as a matter of course, Paul and Barnabas *clasped* the proffered hands. — ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη κ.τ.λ.] The verb to be supplied must be furnished by the context, and must correspond with εἰς.[10] Therefore either

---

[1] See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* iii. 5. 4; Winer, p. 578; Fritzschiorum, *Opusc.* p. 217 f.

[2] Holsten.

[3] While ἰδόντες denotes the immediate *impression of the phenomenon*, γνόντες represents the *knowledge of reflection*. A further step in the description. Hofmann wrongly remarks, "It signifies nothing further than that they *had heard of the occurrence of his calling*." But this they must have already known years before (i. 18 f.).

[4] Piscator, Estius, and others; also Hofmann.

[5] Morus, Koppe, Winer, Fritzsche; de Wette, *both*.

[6] Wieseler on i. 19, and in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1842, p. 95 f.

[7] Comp. on Acts xii. 17. See also Hilgenfeld, p. 158 ff.; and Ewald, *Gesch. d. Apost. Zeit.* p. 221 ff.

[8] Windischmann.

[9] Comp. Credner, *Einl.* I. 2, p. 571 ff.

[10] Comp. i. 18.

[11] Ver. 7.

---

[1] Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3.

[2] Comp. 1 Tim. iii. 15; Rev. iii. 12; Clem. *Cor.* I. 5.

[3] Pind. *Ol.* ii. 146, Ἕκτορ' ἔσφαλε Τροίας ἄμαχον ἀστραβῆ κίονα; "Hector, the impregnable, erect pillar of Troy, he caused to fall," Eur. *Iph. T.* 50. 67 (Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VII. p. 120); Hor. *Od.* i. 35. 13, and Mitscherlich *in loc.* Comp. Maimonides, in *More Nevoch.* ii. 23, "*accipe a prophetis, qui sunt columna generis humani,*" "receive of the prophets who are the column of the human race;" also the passages in Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 728 f.; and the Fathers in Suicer, *Thes.* II. p. 1045 f. [Shakespeare, Henry VI., II. 1: "Brave peers of England, pillars of the state." Milton, Par. Lost, II. 302: "In his rising seemed a pillar of state."]

[4] 1 Cor. iii. 16; Eph. ii. 21.

[5] 1 Cor. iii. 9.

[6] The accentuation usual before Lachmann, στύλοι, is incorrect. See Lipsius, *gramm. Unters.* p. 43.

[7] 1 Macc. vi. 58, xi. 62, *et al.;* Krüger, § 50. 2. 13.

[8] Dougt. *Anal.* p. 123, 1 Macc. vi. 58, and Grimm *in loc.*

[9] With Hofmann, who finds merely a *promise* of fellowship.

[10] See Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 338.

πορευθῶμεν and *πορευθῶσι*,[1] or *apostolatu fungeremur*, ver. 8,[2] or *εὐαγγελισώμεθα*.[3] The latter, in no way unsuitable to *εἰς*,[4] is to be preferred, because it is suggested immediately by the protasis in ver. 7, from which, at the same time, it is evident that the recognition was not merely that of a *συνεργός*, but really amounted to an acknowledgment of *apostolic* equality.[5] Moreover, as regards the partition here settled, the *ethnographical* bearing of which coincided on the whole with the *local* division of territory, we must not supply any such qualification as *praecipue*.[6] On the contrary, the agreement was, "*Ye shall be apostles to the Gentiles, and we to the Jews*;" and nothing beyond this, except the appended clause in behalf of the poor, was thereby settled: so that the state of things hitherto existing in respect to the field of labor on both sides remained undisturbed. The *modifications* of this arrangement obviously and necessarily connected with its *practical* working, primarily occasioned by the existence of the Jewish *διασπορά*—in accordance with which the principle of the division of the spheres of labor could in fact be carried out merely relatively, and without *exclusive* geographical or ethnographical limitation[7]—were left an open question, and not discussed. The idea that the recognition of Paul on the part of the apostles was merely external—simply an outward *concordat*—and that they themselves would have wished to know nothing of the ministry among the Gentiles,[8] is not conveyed in the text, but is, on the contrary, inconsistent with the representation given vv. 7–9. According to this, the apostles recognized the twofold *divine call to apostleship*, by which two nationally different spheres of labor were to be provided with the one gospel; but a merely external and forced agreement, without any acknowledgment or ratification of the principles and modes of procedure which had long regulated the action of Paul and Barnabas, would have been as little compatible with such a recognition as with the *apostolic character* generally. If, however, we take the *κοινωνία* in our passage to be true and heartfelt,[9] then the doubts thrown by Baur and his followers upon the truth of the account of the apostolic council in Acts fall in substance to the ground. How little Paul especially considered his apostolic call to the *Gentiles* as *excluding* the conversion of the Jews from his operations, may be gathered, even laying Acts out of view, from passages such as 1 Cor. ix. 20, Rom. i. 16, ix. 1 ff., xi. 14.

Ver. 10. After *μόνον* interpreters usually supply a verb such as *αἰτοῦντες*, "asking," or *παρακαλοῦντες*, "demanding," which in itself would be allowable,[10] but is nevertheless quite superfluous; for *μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημ.* appears dependent on *δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ* Βαρν. *κοιν.*, so that it is parallel with the preceding *ἵνα* and limits it. Comp. Matthies, Fritzsche, Hofmann. "They made with us a collegiate alliance, to the end that we should be apostles to the Gentiles ; . . . only that we should not omit to remember the poor of the περιτομή (not *merely* of the mother-church) as to support." In that alliance nothing further, *in respect to our relation to the* περιτομή, was designed or settled. On μνημονεύειν in the sense of beneficent care, comp. Ps. ix. 12 ; Hom. *Od.* xviii. 267. — μόνον, which belongs to the whole clause, and τῶν πτωχῶν stand *before* ἵνα on account of the emphasis laid upon them.[1] The *poverty* of the Christians *of Palestine*, which was the principal motive for this provision being added, finds its explanation in the persecutions which they underwent, in the community of goods which they had at first, and perhaps also in the expectation of the *Parousia* as near which they most of all cherished. Moreover, the μόνον κ.τ.λ. by no means excludes the ordinances of the apostolic council, for Paul here has in view nothing but his recognition as apostle on the part of the original apostles in the private discussions held with the latter. How Baur misuses μόνον κ.τ.λ., as contrasted with the supposed *irreconcilable* diversity subsisting in *doctrine*, may be seen in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1849, p. 470 ; *Paulus*, I. p. 142 ff. ed. 2 ; comp. also Holsten. In the face of real antagonism of doctrine, the older apostles certainly would not have tendered Paul their hands ; and had they desired to do so, Paul would have refused them his.[2] [See Note XXXV., p. 96.] — ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι] The aorist, not used instead of the pluperfect, relates to the time from that apostolic alliance to the composition of the epistle. Paul, however, continues in the *singular ;* for soon afterwards he separated himself from Barnabas (Acts xv. 39).[3] Those who identify our journey with that related in Acts xi. xii. must conclude, with Fritzsche, that Paul desired to report *concerning himself*, and hence only mentioned Barnabas (and Titus) as well, *where it was necessary.* Nevertheless this joint-mention, although not *necessary*, would have been very *natural* in our passage ; for ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν had just been said, and then in a single stroke of the representation, with ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα κ.τ.λ., is given the conclusion of the matter so referred to. — αὐτὸ τοῦτο] is not superfluous,[4] as neither αὐτό alone[5] nor τοῦτο alone[6] is used ; it is the emphatic epexegesis of ὅ, *hoc ipsum*,[5] "this very thing," whereby Paul makes his readers feel the contrast between the Jewish Christian *antagonism* and his *zeal of love* thus shown. Studer and Usteri find in αὐτὸ τοῦτο the tacit antithesis, "but nothing further which the apostles had imposed on me." Inappropriately, for the idea of any other matters imposed was already excluded by the previous account. Schott proposes to take[7] ὅ as δι' ὅ,[8] but the assumption of this poetical use cannot be justified except by a necessity such as is presented to us in the N. T. only at Acts xxvi. 16.

---

[1] Bengel, Fritzsche, Wieseler.

[2] Erasmus, Schott, and many others.

[3] Winer, Usteri, de Wette.

[4] See on 2 Cor. x. 16.

[5] In opposition to Holsten.

[6] Bengel, Schott, and others.

[7] Comp. Lechler, p. 415.

[8] Baur, Zeller.

[9] Thiersch (*Kirche im apost. Zeit.* p. 129) well remarks: "When they bade farewell, it was not a parting like that when Luther in the castle at Marburg rejected the hand of Zwingli, or when Jacob Andreae at Montbeliard refused that of Theodore Beza."

[10] Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 207 f.

---

[1] Comp. on Eph. iii. 18; 1 Cor. vii. 29; 2 Cor. ii. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 7, *et al.*

[2] Tertullian (*de praescr.* 23) already gives the right view: "inter se *distributionem officii* ordinaverant, non *separationem evangelii*, nec ut *aliud* alter, sed ut *aliis* alter praedicarent," "They arranged among one another a distribution of office, not a separation of the Gospel; nor so that one would preach one thing, and another, another, but so that one would preach to some, and another to others."

[3] So, correctly, Estius, Winer, Usteri, Schott.

[4] Piscator, Vorstius, Grotius, Morus.

[5] Winer. p. 140.

[6] See Matthiae, p. 1050 ; Kühner, II. p. 527

[7] See Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc.* p. LIII.

[8] See on Acts xxvi. 16.

Still more easily might *αὐτὸ τοῦτο* be explained[1] as *on that very account* (2 Pet. i. 5; Xen. *Anab.* i. 9. 21). But in that case ὃ would so naturally take up what preceded, that there would be no reason why Paul should have brought *on that very account* so prominently forward. It would rather have the appearance of suggesting that, if it had not been for the agreement in question, Paul would *not* have cared for the poor. — *We have no historical vouchers* for the truth of *ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα κ.τ.λ.*; for the conveyance of the contributions in Acts xi. took place earlier than our journey; and the collection mentioned 1 Cor. xvi., 2 Cor. viii. f., Rom. xv. 27, comp. Acts xxi. 17 f., xxiv. 17, occurred *after the composition of our epistle.* But who would doubt that assurance? Looking at the more or less fragmentary accounts in Acts and the Pauline epistles, who knows how often Paul may have sent pecuniary assistance to Palestine? as indeed he may have brought the like with him on occasion of his own journey, Acts xviii. 20–22. It has, however, been wrongly asserted that, by means of this obligation in respect to the poor, a connection was intended to be maintained between the Gentile churches and the primitive church, and that at the bottom of it lay the wish *to bring over the preliminarily converted Gentiles gradually more and more to the principles and the mode of life of the primitive church.*[2] This is an insinuation derived from mere fancy. [See Note XXXVI., p. 96 seq.]

Ver. 11. Paul now carries still further the historical proof of his apostolic independence; "ad summa venit argumentum," "the argument has come to the height," Bengel. For not only has he not been instructed by the apostles; not only has he been recognized by them, and received into alliance with them; but he has even asserted his apostolic authority *against one of them*, and indeed against *Peter.* There is no ground in the text for assuming (with Hofmann) any suspicion on the part of the apostle's opponents, that in Antioch he had been defiant, and in Jerusalem submissive, towards Peter. — *ὅτε δὲ ἦλθε Κηφᾶς κ.τ.λ.*] After the apostolic conference, Paul and Barnabas travelled back to Antioch, Acts xv. 30. During their sojourn there (Acts xv. 33) Peter also came thither,—a journey, which indeed is not mentioned in Acts, but which, just because no date is given in our passage, must be considered as having taken place soon after the matters previously related.[3] —*Κηφᾶς*] The opinion deduced from the unfavorable tenor of this narrative, as bearing upon Peter, by Clement of Alexandria,[4] that the person meant is not the apostle, who certainly in this case is far from corresponding to his destination as "the rock" of the church, but a certain Cephas, one of the seventy disciples, has been already refuted by Jerome, and also by Gregory, *Hom.* 18 *in Ez.* — *κατὰ πρόσωπον*] *To his face* I opposed him. See Acts iii. 13; often in Polybius.[1] The opinion of Jerome, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and several Fathers, that the contention here related was nothing more than a contention *in semblance* (*κατὰ πρόσωπον* = *secundum* speciem! "in appearances"), is only remarkable as a matter of history.[2] — *ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν*] not "quia *reprehensibilis* or *reprehendendus erat*," "because he was blameworthy or to be blamed;"[3] for the Greek participle is never used, like the *Hebrew*, for the verbal adjective,[4] neither in Jude 12, Rev. xxi. 8, nor in Hom. *Il.* i. 388, xiv. 196, xviii. 427; and what a feeble, unnecessary reason to assign would be *ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν* in this sense! Moreover, *καταγιγνώσκειν τινα*,[5] so far as its significations are relevant here, does not mean *reprehendere*, "to blame," at all, but either *to accuse*, which here would not go far enough, or *condemnare*, "to condemn."[6] Hence also it is not: *quia reprehensus* or *accusatus erat*, "because he was blamed or accused,"[7] but: *quia condemnatus erat*, "because he was condemned," whereby the *notorious certainty of the offence occasioned* is indicated, and the *stringent ground* for Paul's coming forward against him is made evident. Peter, through his offensive behavior, had become *the object of condemnation* on the part of the Christians of Antioch; the public judgment had turned against him; and so Paul could not keep silence, but was compelled to do what he certainly did with reluctance. The passive participle has not a *vis reciproca*, "reciprocal force;"[8] the condemnation of Peter was the act of the *Christian public* in Antioch. The idea "convicted *before God*" (Ewald) would have been *expressed*, if it had been so meant. If the condemnation is understood as having ensued *through his own mode of action*,[9] the question as to the persons from whom the condemnation proceeds is left unanswered. [See Note XXXVII., p. 97.]

---

[1] Poppo, *ad Xen. Cyrop.* iv. 1. 21; Matthiae, p. 1041; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Symp.* p. 204 A.

[2] Hilgenfeld, in his *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 141.

[3] Not so late as Acts xviii. 23, as held by Neander, Baumgarten, Lange; and by Wieseler, in favor of his view that the journey Gal. ii. 1 coincides with that of Acts xviii. 22. Grotius, although he considers the journey Gal. ii. 1 as identical with that in Acts xv., strangely remarks: "Videtur significare id tempus, de quo in Act. xiii. 1," "He seems to indicate the time treated in Acts xiii. 1. Also Hug and Schneckenburger, *Zweck d. Apostelg.* p. 108 ff., place the occurrence at Antioch earlier than the apostolic council,—a view which, according to the chronological course of Gal. i. ii., is simply an error; in which, however, Augustine, *ep.* 19 *ad Hieron.*, had preceded them.—Whether, moreover, Peter then visited the church at Antioch *for the first time* (Thiersch, *Kirche im apost. Zeitalt.* p. 432) must be left undecided; but looking at the length of time during which this church had already existed, it is not at all probable that it was his first visit.

[4] *Ap. Euseb.* i. 12.

Ver. 12 ff. Paul now relates the particulars of the occurrence. — *ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου*] *sent by James.* It belongs to *ἐλθεῖν*.[10] *Why* they—and, to judge from the impression made upon Peter, they were certainly men of importance, strict in their Jewish-Christian observances—were sent to Antioch by James, we know not, any more than why Peter journeyed thither.[1] But the conjecture that they belonged to the *ψευδάδελφοι* of ver. 4 (Winer, Schott), conflicts directly *with the fact*, that they were sent by *James:* for at the apostolic conference the latter had nowise made common cause with the *ψευδάδελφοι* ; and therefore in sending any *of them* to Antioch he would have acted very unwisely, or would, with reactionary intent,[2] have simply supplied new fuel to the scarcely settled controversy. Others,[3] connecting the words with *τινάς*, understand *adherents of James*,[4] or, as Winer (comp. Wolf) says, "qui Jacobi auctoritate sive jure seu secus utebantur," "who availed themselves of the authority of James either justly or otherwise ;" but this brings upon James the designation of a party-chief (some Jacobites !), which would be neither necessarily nor wisely introduced here, even supposing Winer's modification to be mentally supplied. Lastly, the explanation of Beza, Grotius, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius (following Chrysostom), that *ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου* means nothing more than *from Jerusalem*, because James was the president of the church there,[5] is an unauthorized setting aside of the person, who is named expressly and not without due reason. — *μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν*] *he joined in meals with the Gentile Christians.*[6] Notice the *imperfect.* The Jew might not eat with Gentiles without incurring Levitical defilement (Acts xi. 3) ; but Peter, who previously by special revelation (Acts x. f.), had been instructed as to the invalidity of this separation in Christianity, had in the apostolic conference defended Christian freedom (Acts xv. 7 ff.), and taken part in passing the decree that, as regards food, the Gentile brethren should only have to abstain from meat offered to idols, things strangled, and blood (Acts xv. 29). This decree was received and accepted with joy by the church at Antioch (Acts xv. 30 f.). It would therefore have been all the easier for Peter in Antioch to follow his divinely attained conviction,[1] and to take part without hesitation in the more familiar intercourse of meals with the Gentile Christians there—free from any scruple that he should defile himself by Gentile food, which no legal enactments restricted except as to those three points. But to this free and correct standpoint the stricter Jewish Christians, who were still entangled in the observances of the Levitical precepts as to purity (comp. Acts xxi. 20), had not been able to rise; and to this class belonged the τινές (ver. 12). When, therefore, these men arrived from Jerusalem and from James, Peter unhappily no longer continued his previous liberal-minded conduct in Antioch, but drew back and separated himself from intercourse at meals with the Gentile Christians, whereby he gave a practical denial to his better conviction. How similar to his conduct in his former denial of the Lord! Calovius, however, justly, in conformity with the temperament of Peter, remarks, "*una* haec fuit Petri *actio* non *habitus*," "this was a single action of Peter and not a habit." — φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτ.] By this are meant the *Jewish Christians generally*, as a class, so far as they were *represented* by those τινές, who belonged to the stricter school. Peter feared the Jewish-Christians' strictness, displeasure, disapprobation, etc. The explanatory gloss of Chrysostom[2] favors Peter, quite against the literal sense of the words (Matt. x. 26, xiv. 5; Mark ix. 18; Luke xii. 5; Acts v. 26; Rom. xiii. 3). — Observe also, on the one hand, the *graphic* force of the *imperfects* ὑπέστ. and ἀφώρ., and, on the other hand, the expression of his own bad precedent, ἑαυτόν, which belongs not merely to ἀφώρ., but also to ὑπέστ. (Polyb. vii. 17. 1, xi. 15. 2, i. 16. 10); he withdrew *himself*, etc., and thereby induced his *Jewish-Christian associates also* to enter on a like course (ver. 13). It is not, according to the context, correct that these imperfects express an *enduring* separation (Wieseler); the behavior begins when the τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ. have come; it excites the unfavorable judgment of the church, and Paul immediately places himself in decided opposition to Peter. The imperfects are therefore the usual *adumbrativa*, "adumbrative;" they place the withdrawal and separation of Peter, as it were, *before the eyes* of the readers. On the other hand, the συνυπεκρίθ. which follows is the wider action which took place and served further to challenge Paul; hence the *aorist*.

---

[1] Comp. κατ' ὀφθαλμούς, Herod. i. 120; Xen. *Hiero*, 1, 14: Gal. iii. 1; and κατ' ὄμμα, Eur. *Rhes.* 421, *Bacch.* 469. Not *coram omnibus*, "before all" (Erasmus, Beza, Vatablus), which is not expressed until ver. 14.

[2] A contest arose on this point between Jerome and Augustine. The former characterized the *reprehensio* in our passage as *dispensatoria*, so contrived by Peter and Paul, in order to convince the Jewish Christians of the invalidity of the law, when they should see that Peter had the worst of it against Paul. Augustine, on the contrary, asserted the correct sense, and maintained that the interpretation of Jerome introduced untruth into the Scriptures. See Jerome, *Ep.* 86–97; Augustine, *Ep.* 8–19. Subsequently Jerome gave up his view and adopted the right one. *c. Pelag.* i. 8; *Apol. adv. Rufin.* iii. 1. See Möhler, *gesammelte Schriften*, I. p. 1 ff.

[3] Vulgate, Castalio, Calvin, Beza, Cornelius à Lapide, Elsner, Wolf, and others; also Koppe, Borger, Flatt, Matthies.

[4] Gesenius, *Lehrgeb.* p. 791; Ewald, p. 538.

[5] Not to be confounded with καταγ. τινός τι, as is done by Matthias.

[6] Comp. 1 John iii. 20, 21; Ecclus. xiv. 2, xix. 5.

[7] Ambrose, Luther, Estius, and others; also Winer, Schott, de Wette.

[8] Bengel, comp. Rückert, "because *he had an evil conscience.*"

[9] Bengel, Lechler, p. 423; comp. Windischmann and Hofmann.

[10] Comp. Plat. *Prot.* p. 309 B, ἀπ' ἐκείνου ἔρχομαι: Matt. xxvi. 47; Mark v. 35; 1 Thess. iii. 6.

---

[1] The book of Acts is silent both on this point and also as to the whole scene between Peter and Paul,—a silence indeed, which, according to Baur and Zeller, is supposed to be maintained intentionally, and in consistency with the false representation of the transactions in Jerusalem. According to Ritschl (*altkath. Kirche*, p. 145), they were deputed by James to bring the relation between the Jewish and Gentile Christians back to the rule of the apostolic decree, as James understood it, that is, according to Ritschl, in the sense of a retractation of the Jewish-Christian defection from the law, and on behalf of restoring the separation between the two parties as respected their customs of eating. This assumed task of the *τινές* is neither in any way intimated in the text, nor is there a trace of it in Acts (comp., on the contrary, xv. 30 ff.). Just as little can it be proved that, as Ewald thinks, a decree had been passed in the church at Jerusalem that the Jewish Christian should refrain from eating in company with Gentile Christians (because he did not know whether blood or something strangled might be among their food), and that those *τινές* had come to Antioch to make known this new decree. Hilgenfeld also assumes that those sent by James had some charge relating to withdrawal from the Gentile Christians. Comp. Holsten, *z. Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 357, in whose opinion they were sent after Peter, because his intercourse with the Gentiles had been notified at Jerusalem.

[2] So de Wette, whereby, however, the character of James is placed in a very awkward position, which is not to be supported by Acts xxi. 18.

[3] As Studer, Usteri, Zeller. So also Vömel, *Br. a. d. Gal. mit deutsch. Uebers. u. krit. Anm.*, Frankf. 1865, p. 29.

[4] Comp. *οἱ ἀπὸ Πλάτωνος* and the like ; Schaefer, *Melet.* p. 26 ff. ; Bernhardy, p. 222.

[5] Comp. Koppe.

[6] Comp. on *συνεσθίειν* in this sense, Plat. *Legg.* ix. p. 881 D ; Luke xv. 2 ; 1 Cor. v. 11.

Ver. 13. *And the rest of the Jewish Christians also played the hypocrite jointly with him*—those, namely, living in Antioch, who previously, in harmony with the liberal standpoint which they had already attained to, had held fellowship at meals with the Gentile Christians of the place, but now, misled by the influential example of Peter, had likewise drawn back. This was *hypocrisy* on their part and on Peter's, because, although at the bottom of their hearts convinced of Christian freedom, they, from fear of men (ver. 12), concealed the more liberal conviction of which they were conscious, and behaved just as if they entertained the opposite view. It is true that the apostolic council had not decided anything as to the conduct of the Jewish Christians among Gentile Christians; but the immorality consisted in the inwardly untrue *duplicity* of their behavior, which was more than a mere *inconsistency* (Baur) of reformed Judaism, *conceived* by Paul as being hypocrisy (Hilgenfeld).[1] — *καὶ Βαρνάβ.*] *even Barnabas*, who was my associate withal in the apostleship to the Gentiles (ver. 9), and should consequently least of all have ventured insincerely to deny the principle of Christian freedom, to the disparagement of the Gentile Christians! So injurious was the effect of Peter's example! — *συναπήχθη*] *was jointly led away* (led astray), namely, from his own standpoint.[2] *ὥστε* with a *finite verb*, in the secondary sentence (comp. John iii. 16), denotes the consequence simply as a fact which has occurred.[3] The *infinitive* would make the representation subjective (the seduction being conceived as a necessary result). — *αὐτῶν*] that is, *αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν Ἰουδ.* It is emphatically prefixed. The dative is *instrumental: by* their hypocrisy, not *to* their hypocrisy (Luther and others). No one can, without wronging Paul in respect to the choice of his strongly inculpating expression,[4] either *call in question* the fact that the conduct of *Peter* is here expressly designated as *hypocrisy*,[5] or reduce it to a mere *supposition;* although Ritschl, p. 145, is of opinion that the reproach thus used does not quite evince a clear and thorough conviction of the rightness of the non-Jewish practice. The purposely chosen expression in our passage shows, on the contrary, that *Peter's conviction, which was well known to Paul*, agreed with the conviction of Paul himself, although it was *hypocritically denied* by the former. Peter's *ὑπόκρισις*, according to the text, consisted in the *Ἰουδαΐζειν*, to which he had drawn back after his intercourse with the Gentile Christians, not in his previous fellowship with them, which is alleged to have been "a momentary unfaithfulness to his real conviction."[6] And the censure which Paul—certainly unwillingly, and with a complete realizing and appreciating of the moral situation to which it has reference—has directed against Peter expressly on the ground of *hypocrisy*,[7] exhibits plainly the agreement in principle of the personal convictions of the two apostles.[1]

---

[1] That the *Christian* fellowship in meals included also the joint observance of the *agapae* (which Thiersch, Hilgenfeld, and others take to be meant), is obvious. It is not, however, expressly denoted by συνήσθιεν.

[2] οὐ τοῦτο φοβούμενος μὴ κινδυνεύσῃ, ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ ἀποστῶσιν, "not apprehending that he was incurring danger, but that they might apostatize," comp. Theophylact, μὴ σκανδαλισθέντες ἀποσκιρτήσωσι τῆς πίστεως, "lest being offended they might depart from the faith," which is followed by Piscator, Grotius, Estius, and others.

---

[1] The view of Holsten, *z. Ev. des Paul. u. Petr.* p. 357 ff., is similar. — On *συνυπεκρίθ.*, comp. Polyb. iii. 92. 5, v. 49. 7; Plut. *Mar.* 14. 17; Joseph. *Bell.* xv. 7. 5.

[2] Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 17, Rom. xii. 16, and Wetstein *in loc.*

[3] See Tittmann, *Synon.* II. p. 70; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 1012 f.; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 772.

[4] This expression is all the more strictly to be understood as it stands, since Paul has not anywhere else in his epistles or speeches used either the word *ὑποκρίνεσθαι*, or *ὑποκριτής*, or (with the exception of 1 Tim. iv. 2) *ὑπόκρισις*. He would be the less likely to have omitted to weigh the gravity of the reproach conveyed in this very word otherwise strange to him, especially seeing that it was used after so *long* a time and was directed against *Peter*. This remark also applies in opposition to Schneckenburger in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1855, p. 554 f., and to Möller on de Wette.

[5] Schwegler, I. p. 129.

[6] Baur, in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1849, p. 476; Schwegler, Zeller, Hilgenfeld.

[7] Not merely (comp. de Wette) on account of an easily excusable want of firmness and clearness in conviction (Bisping), or of a momentary throwing of the same into the background *under pressure of circumstances* (Reithmayr). Even Erasmus ex-

Ver. 14. Ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσι] ὀρθοποδεῖν,[2] not preserved elsewhere in Biblical language, undoubtedly means to be *straight-footed*, that is, to *walk with straight feet*.[3] Here used in a figurative sense—as words expressive of *walking* are favorites with Paul in representing ethical ideas[4]—equivalent to *acting rightly* (with straightness), *conducting oneself properly*.[5] It is the moral ὀρθότης πράξεως,[6] the opposite of the moral σκολιόν,[7] στρεβλόν,[8] χωλόν.[9] According to the leaning of Greek authors towards the direct mode of expression, the *present* is quite regular.[10] — πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθ. τοῦ εὐαγγέλ.] πρός is understood as *secundum*, "according to,"[11] by most expositors;[12] by others in the sense of *direction towards the mark*,[13] which would mean, "*so as to maintain and promote the truth of the gospel*." The former interpretation is to be preferred, because it is the more simple and the first to suggest itself, and it yields a very suitable sense. Hence: *corresponding to* the truth, which is the contents of the gospel (ver. 5). Certainly Paul never in verbs of walking expresses the *rule* prepositionally by πρός, but by κατά;[14] but in this passage πρὸς κ.τ.λ. is the epexegesis of ὀρθῶς, according to its *ethical* idea. — ἔμπροσθεν πάντων] consequently, not merely between themselves, but *in the sight of the whole church*, although not assembled expressly for this purpose;[15] τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας ἐνώπιον πάντων ἔλεγχε, ἵνα καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ φόβον ἔχωσι, 1 Tim. v. 20. "Non enim utile erat errorem, qui *palam* noceret, *in secreto* emendare," "it was not advantageous to correct in secret an error which injured openly," Augustine. — εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων κ.τ.λ.] that is, "If thou, although a born Jew, orderest thy mode of living in conformity with that of the born Gentiles, χωρὶς Ἰουδαικῆς παρατηρήσεως, 'different from the Jewish observance' (Chrysostom), and not with that of the born Jews—a course of conduct, which thou hast just practically exemplified by eating in company with Gentile Christians—how comes it to pass that thou (by the example of the wholly opposite conduct which thou hast now adopted since the arrival of those τινές) urgest the born Gentiles to adopt the custom of the born Jews?" What a contradiction of conduct is it, thus in one breath to live ἐθνικῶς and to urge the ἔθνη to the Ἰουδαΐζειν! The present ζῇς denotes

---

erts himself to come at length to the result, that "Pauli objurgatio nihil aliud fuit quam *confirmatio parum adhuc sibi constantium*," "Paul's reproof was nothing but an assertion of the inconsistencies."

[1] Comp. Wiesinger, *de consensu locor. Gal.* ii. *et Act.* xv. p. 36; Lechler, p. 426.

[2] Comp. ὀρθοβατεῖν, *Anthol.* ix. 11. 4.

[3] Comp. ὀρθόπους, Soph. *Ant.* 985; Nicand. Alexiph. 419, ὀρθόποδες βαίνοντες.

[4] Comp. περιπατεῖν, στοιχεῖν κ.τ.λ.

[5] ὀρθοπραγεῖν, Aristot. *Pol.* i. 5. 8. Vulgate, "*recte ambularent*." Hofmann, "*to stand* with straight foot." But comp. ὀξυποδεῖν, ὠκυποδεῖν, to be swift-footed, that is, swift in running. The *standing* would probably have been *expressed*, as perhaps by ὀρθοστατεῖν. The ὀρθοποδῶν is not lame (χωλεύει), but makes τροχιὰς ὀρθὰς τοῖς ποσίν, Heb. xii. 13.

[6] Plat. *Men.* p. 97 B.

[7] Plat. *Gorg.* p. 525 A.

[8] Ecclus. xxxvi. 25.

[9] Heb. xii. 13.

[10] See Kühner, § 846.

[11] 2 Cor. v. 10; Luke xii. 47; Bernhardy, p. 265.

[12] Including Winer, Rückert, de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler.

[13] Flacius, Grotius, Estius, Wolf, Morus, Hofmann.

[14] Rom. viii. 4, xiv. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 3, *et al.*

[15] Thiersch.

that which was *constant, accordant with principle*, in Peter's case.[1] This is *laid down* by Paul, with the argumentative εἰ, as *certain and settled*, and that not merely by inference from his recent experience of Peter having eaten in company with Gentiles, but also on the ground of his knowledge otherwise of this apostle and of his practical principles on this point, with which the ἐθνικῶς ζῆν just before actually carried out by Peter was in accordance. Groundlessly and erroneously Rückert labors[2] to extract an entirely different meaning, understanding Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῇς in an *ideal* sense (Rom. ii. 28 f.; John i. 48), and ἐθνικῶς ζῇς as its opposite : "By thy present conduct thou showest thyself truly not as a genuine Jew, but as a Gentile (sinner) ; how art thou at liberty to ask that the Gentiles should adopt Jewish customs, which by thy behavior thou thyself dost not honor ?" But, in fact, the reader could only take the explanation of the ἐθνικῶς ζῇς from μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν (ver. 12), and of the Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῇς from ὑπέστελλε . . . περιτομῆς (ver. 12). No one could light upon the alleged ideal view (reverting, in the apodosis, to the empirical !), the more especially as the *breaking off* from eating with *the Gentiles* would have to be regarded as a *Gentile* habit (in an ethical sense) ! The ζῆν is not the *moral* living according to the Gentile or the Jewish fashion, but the shaping of the life *with reference to the category of external social observances* within the Christian communion, such as, in the individual case in question, the following (Ἰουδαϊκῶς) or non-following (ἐθνικῶς) of the Jewish restrictions as to eating. — πῶς] *qui fit, ut*, "how does it happen that" (Rom. iii. 6, vi. 2, x. 14, and frequently), indicating the *incomprehensibleness* of this morally contradictory behavior. — τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαΐζειν] *indirect* compulsion. For the Gentile Christians in Antioch must very naturally have felt themselves constrained by the imposing *example* of the highly-esteemed Peter to look upon the Jewish habit of living—the observance of the special peculiarities of the outward legal Judaism[3]—as something belonging to Christianity, and necessary for partaking in Christian fellowship and for attaining the Messianic salvation ; and they would shape their conduct in practice in accordance with this view.[4] De Wette[5] assumes, that the emissaries of James *preached* the principle of the necessity of observing the law, and that Peter *gave his support*, at least tacitly, to this preaching. This is not at all intimated in the text, and is not rendered necessary by the literal sense of ἀναγκάζειν, which is sufficiently explained by the *moral constraint* of the inducement of so influential an example, as it is often used in classical authors, "de varia necessitate quam praesens rerum conditio efficit," "of the various necessity which the present condition of affairs effects."[6] The view which understands the word here not at all of indirect constraint, but of definite demands,[1] by which Peter sought to turn them back into the path of Jewish Christianity, is opposed to the divine instruction imparted to this apostle, to his utterances at the council, and to our context, according to which the ἀναγκάζειν can have consisted in nothing more than the οὐκ ὀρθοποδεῖν as it is represented in ver. 12 f., and consequently must have been merely a practical, indirect compulsion, not conveyed in any express demands. Wieseler obscures the intelligibility of the whole passage by understanding the 'Ιουδαΐζειν of the *observance of the restrictions as to food enacted by the apostolic council.* In decisive opposition to this view it may be urged, that in the whole context this council is left entirely unmentioned; further, that these restrictions as to food had nothing to do with the Jewish proselytes (on whose account, possibly, their observance might have been called an 'Ιουδαΐζειν); lastly, that the compliance with the same on the part of the church at Antioch, especially so soon after the council (see on ver. 11), cannot, according to Acts xv. 30, at all be a matter of doubt. Moreover, Paul, who had himself together with Peter so essentially co-operated towards this decree of the council, have—in the presence of Peter, of the Christians of Antioch, and even of those who were sent by James—characterized the obedience given to the restrictions in question by the inapplicable and ill-sounding name 'Ιουδαΐζειν? It would have shown at least great want of tact.

---

[1] Contrary to the view of Hilgenfeld and others.

[2] Since it does not run : ἐπειδή . . . ἔζησας.

[3] The Ἰουδαΐζειν : comp. Esth. viii. 17 ; Plut. Cic. 7. Where a freedman is spoken of, who was ἔνοχος τῷ Ἰουδωΐζειν, "chargeable with Judaizing," and in reference to whom Cicero says : τί Ἰουδαίῳ πρὸς χοίρον, "What has a Jew to do with swine ;" comp. also Ignat. *ad Magnes.* 10, ἄσοπόν ἐστιν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν λαλεῖν καὶ Ἰουδαΐζειν, "It is absurd to profess Christ Jesus and yet to Judaize."

[4] Comp. Usteri, p. 66 f.

[5] Comp. also Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 198 f., *Komment.* p. 168.

[6] Sturz, *Lex. Xen.* I. 18. 6.

Ver. 15. *A continuation of the address to Peter down to ver.* 21.[2] Others have looked upon vv. 15–21 as addressed *to the Galatians*;[3] but to this view it may be objected, that Paul himself does not indicate the return to his readers until iii. 1, and that the bare, brief reproach in ver. 14 would neither correspond to the historical character of so important an event, nor stand in due relation with the purpose for which Paul narrates it (see on ver. 11); as indeed he himself has in vv. 11 and 14 so earnestly prepared the way for, and announced, his opposition, that the reader could not but expect something *more* than that mere question—so hurriedly thrown out—of indignant surprise.[4] And how could he have written to his (for the most part) Gentile-Christian *readers* ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι κ.τ.λ., without telling them whom he meant thereby ? Just as little can we assume that Paul again turns to the Galatians with καὶ ἡμεῖς in ver. 16,[1] or in ver. 17,[2] or in ver. 18 ;[3] or that he[4] has been imperceptibly *led away* from the thread of his historical statement, so that it is not possible to show *how much* belongs to the speech *at* Antioch. No, the *whole* of this discourse (vv. 15–21)—thoroughly unfolding the truth from principles, and yet so vivid, and in fact annihilating his opponent—harmonizes so fully with the importance of a public step against Peter, as well as with the object which Paul had in view in relating this occurrence to the *Galatians* especially, among whom indeed these very principles, against which Peter offended, were in great danger, that, up to its tragic conclusion ἄρα Χριστὸς δωρεὰν ἀπέϑανεν (ver. 21), it must be regarded as a unity—as the effusion directed against Peter at Antioch ; but, at the same time, it cannot be maintained that Paul spoke the words quite *literally* thus, as he here, after so long a lapse of time, quotes from lively recollection of the scene which he could not forget. — ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἐϑνῶν ἁμαρτ.] Paul begins his dogmatic explanation in regard to the reproach expressed in ver. 14 with a concession : "*We are Jews by birth* (in this Paul feels the whole advantage of belonging to the ancient holy people of God, Rom. iii. 1 f., ix. 1 ff.), *and not sinners of the Gentiles*" (by Gentile descent). Gentiles as such, because they are ἄνομοι and ἄϑεοι (Rom. ii. 12 ; 1 Cor. ix. 21 ; Eph. ii. 12), are to the Israelite consciousness ἁμαρτωλοί and ἄδικοι (1 Sam. xv. 18 ; Tob. xiii. 6 ; Wisd. x. 20 : comp. Luke xviii. 32, xxiv. 7 ; 1 Cor. vi. 1); and from *this*—the theocratical—point of view Paul says ἐξ ἐϑνῶν ἁμαρτωλοί, born *Gentiles*, and as such *sinners*, as *all* Gentiles are. Not as if he would look upon the Ἰουδαίους as *not sinners ;* according to the sequel, indeed, they needed justification equally with the Gentiles (see Rom. ii. 3, 22 f., v. 12 ; Eph. ii. 2 f.). But the passage affirms that the Jews—as the possessors of the revelation and the law, of the ancient theocratic υἱοϑεσια "adoption," and the promises (Rom. ix. 4), and as belonging to the holy ἀπαρχή, "first fruits," and root stock of the theocracy (Rom. xi. 16)—possessed as their own a religious consecration of life, whereby they stood on a certain stage of righteousness in virtue of which, although it was not that of the true δικαιοσύνη, they were nevertheless exalted far above the Gentiles in their natural state of sinfulness (Eph. ii. 12 ; Tit. iii. 5). Luther well says: "Nos natura Judaei in *legali* justitia excedimus quidem gentes, qui peccatores sunt, si nobis conferantur, ut qui nec legum nec opera ejus habent ; verum non in hoc justi sumus coram Deo, *externa* est illa justitia nostra," "We who are by nature Jews in *legal* righteousness exceed the Gentiles, who are sinners, if they be compared with us, as they have neither the law nor its works ; but in this we are not righteous before God ; such righteousness of ours is *external*." If ἁμαρτωλοί had not been unduly understood according to the purely ethical idea (the opposite of sinlessness), the discourse would not

---

[1] Ritschl, p. 146.

[2] So Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jerome, Estius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Tittmann, (*Opusc.* p. 365), Knapp (*Scr. var. arg.* II. p. 452 f.), Flatt, Winer, Rückert, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette and Möller, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Holsten.

[3] Theodore of Mopsuestia, Oecumenius, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Semler, Koppe, Matthies, Hermann, Hofmann, Wieseler, Reithmayr.

[4] Indeed the practical *renunciation* (not mere *denial*) of the principle of Christian freedom required a renewed *apology* for, and *vindication* of, the latter; especially as Paul had called Peter to account *before the assembled church*, whereby the act assumed a solemnity to which the brief question in ver. 14 alone could in no way seem adequate, and least of all could it suffice to procure a duly proportionate satisfaction for the offence given to the *church* (ver. 11). He does not, however, "demonstrate" his explanation to Peter (Wieseler's difficulty), but presents it in the most vivid and striking dialectic, compressing everything which would have afforded matter for a very copious demonstration sharply and sternly, towards the defeat of the great opponent who had been unfaithful to himself. Hofmann inconsiderately holds that, if Paul after the concession ἐθνικῶς ζῇς κ. οὐκ 'Ιουδαϊκῶς had thus explained himself in a detailed statement to Peter, he would have acted *absurdly*. It would have been absurd, if Paul, in order to say the *two or three*

---

words to Peter recorded in ver. 14, had brought the whole act of the κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην *before the assembled church.*

[1] Calovius, Paulus.

[2] Luther, Calvin.

[3] Cajetanus, Neander.

[4] Erasmus and Estius by way of suggestion, Usteri.

have been so broken up as by Elsner, Er. Schmidt, and others: "*Nos natura Judaei, licet non ex gentibus, peccatores*," "We, by nature Jews, although not of the Gentiles, are sinners;" comp. Paulus. Hofmann's view is also similar: "that the apostle excluded from himself that sinfulness only, which was implied in Gentile descent—characteristic of those not belonging naturally to the Jewish nationality."[1] Paul wishes, not to affirm the different *nature of the sinfulness* of those born as Jews and Gentiles respectively, but to recall the *theocratic advantage* of the Jews over the sinners of Gentile descent; in spite of which advantage, however, etc. (ver. 16). The contrast lies in the idea of a theocratic *sanctitas*, "holiness," peculiar to the born *Jew*, on the one hand;[2] and on the other, of a profane *vitiositas*, "viciousness," wherewith the *Gentile* descent is burdened. [See Note XXXVIII., p. 97.]—has the emphasis: *We on our part* (I and thou). μέν is not to be supplied ἡμεῖς] here (Rückert, Schott); but the concession in ver. 15 stands by itself, and the contrast *is added* without preparation in ver. 16.[3] The contrast thus strikes one *more vividly*, and hence the absence of the μέν can afford no ground for calling in question (with Hofmann) the sense of a concession.[4] On the difference between Ἰουδαῖοι (theocratic bond of union) and Ἑβραῖοι (nationality), see Wieseler.[5]

Ver. 16 is usually construed so that εἰδότες . . . Χριστοῦ is a parenthesis; and either the sentence is made to begin with ἡμεῖς in ver. 15, and this ἡμεῖς is again taken up by the subsequent καὶ ἡμεῖς,[6] or *sumus* is supplied after ἁμαρτωλοί, a new sentence is commenced by εἰδότες, and καὶ ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ. is taken as apodosis.[7] Both forms of construction would give εἰδότες . . . Χριστοῦ as the *motive* for the ἐπιστεύσαμεν. But in this way the statement, how Paul and Peter (for *these* are the subject; see on ver. 15) attained to faith, would not tally with history, for the conversion of these two apostles did not at all take place by means of logical process in the argumentative way of εἰδότες . . . ἐπιστεύσαμεν. Both of them were in fact *miraculously* and *suddenly* laid hold of by Christ; and thereby, on their becoming believers, the light of the statement of purpose in the sequel dawned upon them. We must therefore consider as correct the punctuation of Lachmann,[8] who is followed by Wieseler: a comma only before εἰδότες, and a period after Χριστοῦ, "*We are Jews by birth and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing however*" (εἰδότες still belonging to the ἐσμέν, which has to be supplied), that is, since we nevertheless know, *that a man is not justified*, etc.; so that what thou, Peter, doest (ver. 15), completely conflicts with this certainty, which we have notwithstanding of our Jewish pre-eminence. [See Note XXXIX., p. 97.] — οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος] The emphatically prefixed δικαιοῦται is negatived : *a man is not justified.* As to the idea of δικαιοῦσθαι, see on Rom. i. 17. Here also it appears clearly as an *actus forensis*, and as incompatible with the perversion of the idea by the Catholics and the followers of Osiander.[1] *From works of the law*, which would be the determining ground of God's acquittal ; *by means of faith*, which is imputed by God as righteousness (Rom. v. 5, 24 f.),—these are the *contrasted points*, while the *idea* of δικαιοῦσθαι is *the same.*[2] — ἐξ ἔργων νόμου] νόμου is not *subjective* (works, which the law by its precepts call forth), but *objective :* works, *which relate to the law*, that is, works *by which the precepts of the law are fulfilled*, which have as their opposite the ἁμαρτήματα νόμου, Wisd. ii. 12.[3] Our passage testifies also in favor of this view by the contrast of πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, inasmuch as the one relation (ἔργων) to the one object (νόμου) stands correlatively contrasted with the other relation (πίστεως) to the other object (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Schott, following the older expositors,[4] quite erroneously limits νόμος to the *ceremonial law*,—a limitation which never occurs in the N. T.[5] and, especially where justification is the matter in question, would be quite unsuitable ; for the impossibility of justification by the law has reference to the *whole* law, viewed in its requirements *jointly and severally*, which in its full extent, and in the way willed by God, no man can fulfil.[6] — ἐὰν μή] not a compromise between justification by works and justification by faith in the Jewish-Christian consciousness,[7] but a transition to another mode of conception : A man is not justified by the works of the law ; *he is not justified, except by*, etc.[8] Consequently we have here neither *justification by the works*, which are done by means of faith (the Catholic view), nor *Christ's* fulfilment of the law, which is *apprehended* by faith.[9] The former is not Pauline,[10] and the latter has only its indirect truth (for the N. T. nowhere teaches the imputation of Christ's obedience to the law), in so far as the atoning work of the Lord completed on the cross, which is the specific object and main matter of justifying faith, necessarily presupposes His active, sinless obedience (2 Cor. v. 21), of which, however, nothing is here said. [See Note XL., p. 97.] But here in ἐὰν μή we have the "*sola* fide" of Luther and his Church.[11] It is only the man justified solely by faith, who thereupon fulfils by means of the Spirit the requirements of the law.[12] This is the moral completion of the relation of the law to redemption. — Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] object: *on Jesus Christ.* Comp. Mark xi. 22.[1] — ἐξ and διά denote the same idea (of causality) under two forms (that of origin and that of mediate agency), as Paul in general is fond of varying his prepositions.[2] In διά [3] faith is conceived as the subjective condition of justification—the presence of which is the necessary *causa medians* of the latter. Certainly the man, as soon as he believes, enters *immediately* into the state of justification; but the *preposition* has (notwithstanding what Hofmann says) nothing to do with this relation, any more than ἐξ postpones *the being righteous,* as the result of action, *until the very end of life,* whereas it may be conceived at any moment of life, as a result *for the time being.* — καὶ ἡμεῖς] begins a new sentence (see above). That which Paul had just laid before Peter as a point on which both were convinced,—ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστ. Ἰ. Χ.,—he now confirms by reminding him of the righteousness which *they also* had aimed at in having become believers (ἐπιστεύσαμεν); so that καὶ ἡμεῖς, *even we* both, supplies the special application of the foregoing general ἄνθρωπος. The order Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν lays a greater stress on the *Messianic character* of the historical person who is the object of faith, than is the case in the usual order.[4] — ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ][5] These words, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, take up again what had just been said with solemn emphasis, by means of the confirmatory ὅτι, *since indeed.* Πᾶσα σάρξ conveys the idea of "*all men*" (comp. above, ἄνθρωπος), with the accompanying idea of moral weakness and sinfulness, on which is based both the need of justification, and also its impossibility by means of works in the sight of the justifying God.[6] Looking at the difference in the terms used and the absence of the usual formula of quotation, it is not to be assumed that Paul intended here to give a *Scripture-proof* (from Ps. cxliii. 2), as Wieseler and others think. An involuntary echo of the language may have occurred, while the idea was more precisely defined. The *negation* is here also not to be separated from the verb; for it is not πᾶσα σάρξ which is negatived, but δικαιωθήσεται in reference to πᾶσα σάρξ. Fritzsche[7] aptly says: "non probabitur per praestitum legi obsequium quicquid est carnis," "whatever is of the flesh will not be approved by means of the obedience rendered the law." Lastly, the *future* denotes that which never *will occur.* The reference to the *judgment* (Rom. v. 19), which is discovered here by Hofmann and the earlier expositors, is quite out of place.[8]

---

[1] Comp. his *Schriftbew.* I. p. 564, 610, "Our sinfulness does not bear the characteristic Gentile shape."

[2] Calvin appropriately says: "Quia autem promissis *haereditariam* benedictionem faciebat, ideo *naturale* vocatur hoc bonum," "But since the promise made the blessing *hereditary*, this advantage is on this account called *natural*."

[3] Comp. Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 423; Bremi, *ad Isocr. Paneg.* 105, "quando altera pars per δέ sit evehenda," "since the other part is to be inferred by means of the δέ."

[4] Comp. also Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 3. 15.

[5] *Ueber d. Hebräerbrief*, 1861, II. p. 28.

[6] So Castalio and others, Winer, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Holsten, Reithmayr.

[7] Beza and others; also Rückert, Usteri, Schott, Fritzsche, *d. conform. N. T. Lachm.* p. 53, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Hofmann, Matthias, Möller.

[8] In the *small* edition; in the *larger* one the usual punctuation is followed.

---

[1] See especially Wieseler *in loc.*

[2] Comp. on Rom. iii. 25 f.

[3] See on Rom. ii. 15.

[4] Including Theodoret, Pelagius, Erasmus.

[5] Although, according to the context, at one time the ethical, and at another the ritual, aspect of the law preponderates. Comp. on Rom. iii. 20, and Schmid, *bibl. Theol.* II. p. 336.

[6] Comp. iii. 10 ; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 259.

[7] Holsten, in spite of the *apodosis.*

[8] Comp. *Hymn. Cer.* 77 f., οὐδέ τις ἄλλος αἴτιος ἀθανάτων, εἰ μὴ νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς, "nor is there any other cause of immortals except (εἰ μὴ) the cloud-gatherer Zeus."

[9] So also Jatho, *Br. an d. Gal.* p. 18 f.

[10] See the constantly repeated attacks on the part of the Catholics against the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith, in Möhler, *Symbol.* p. 132, ed. 4 ; Reithmayr, p. 179 ff. More unprejudiced is Döllinger, *Christenth. u. Kirche*, pp. 187, 202, and elsewhere. On the other hand, Romang (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, 1, 2) has made *too much* concession to the Catholic justification by works, and has, like Hengstenberg, erroneously assumed a gradual progress of justification.

[11] Comp. on Rom. iii. 28.

[12] See on Rom viii. 4.

Ver. 17. The δέ dialectically *carries on* the refutation of Peter; but the protasis beginning with εἰ cannot have its apodosis in εὑρέθημεν κ. ἀ. ἁμ.;[9] on the contrary, it runs on as far as ἁμαρτωλοί, which is then followed by the interrogatory apodosis. Consequently : *But if we* (in order to show thee, from what has been just said, how opposed to Christ thy conduct was), *although we sought to be justified in Christ, were found even on our part sinners.* This protasis supposes that which must have been the case, if Peter's Judaizing conduct had been in the right ; namely, that the result would then have been that faith does not lead to, or does not suffice for, justification, but that it is requisite to combine with it the observance of the Jewish law. *If* faith does *not* render the Ἰουδαΐζειν superfluous, as was naturally to be concluded from the course of conduct pursued by Peter, then this seeking after *justification* in Christ has shown itself so ineffectual, that the believer just stands on an equality with the *Gentiles*, because he has ceased to be a Jew and yet has not attained to righteousness in Christ : he is therefore now nothing else than an ἁμαρτωλός, just as the Gentile is. But if this be the case, the apodosis now asks, *Is Christ, therefore, minister of sin* (and not of righteousness) ?—seeing that our faith in Him, which seeks for righteousness by Him, has the sad result that we have been found like the Gentiles in a state of sin. The *answer* to this question is, *Far be it!* It is a result to be abhorred, that Christ, instead of bringing about the righteousness sought in Him, should be the promoter of *sin*. Consequently the state of things supposed in the protasis is an anti-Christian absurdity. — The subject of ζητοῦντες and εὑρέθημεν is, as before, Peter and Paul. — ζητοῦντες] emphatically prefixed, in reference to the preceding sentence *of purpose*, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν κ.τ.λ. ; so that this ζητεῖν δικαιωθ. is not in reality different from the πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστ., but denotes the same thing as respects its *tendency*. To the ζητοῦντες then corresponds the εὑρέθημεν, which introduces an entirely different *result : if we have been found*, if it has turned out as a matter of fact, that, etc.[1] As to εὑρέθημεν we must, however, notice that—as in the apodosis ἀρὰ Χριστός κ.τ.λ. we cannot without proceeding arbitrarily supply anything but the simple ἐστιν, and not ἂν ἦν (iii. 21)—the aorist requires the explanation : *inventi sumus*, "*have been* found,"[2] and therefore neither *reperimur*, "*are* found,"[3] nor *inventi essemus*, "*would be* found,"[4] nor *should be* found,[5] nor *were to be* found.[6] Observe, moreover, that in εὑρέθ., in contrast to ζητοῦντες κ.τ.λ., the accessory idea of *something unexpected* suggests itself.[1] — ἐν Χριστῷ] nothing else than what was previously put as ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, but *expressed* according to the notion that in Christ, whose person and work form the object of faith, justification *has its causal basis.*[2] Its opposite : ἐν νόμῳ, iii. 11, and the ἰδία δικαιοσύνη, Rom. x. 3. — καὶ αὐτοί] *et ipsi*, *also on our part*, includes Peter and Paul in the class of ἁμαρτωλοί previously referred to in ver. 15. — ἆρα Χ. ἁμαρτ. διάκ.] is, at any rate, *a question* (Vulgate, *numquid*), for with Paul μὴ γένοιτο is always preceded by a question.[3] With this, however, either mode of writing, ἄρα (Lachmann) or ἆρα (Tischendorf), may stand. Both express *igitur*, *rebus sic se habentibus*, "therefore, as matters stand," but ἆρα (Luke xviii. 8 ; Acts viii. 30), although Paul does not elsewhere use it (but just as little does he use an interrogative ἄρα[4]), is the livelier and stronger.[5] To take ἆρα for ἆρ' οὐ, *nonne* (Olshausen, Schott), is a purely arbitrary suggestion, which fails to apprehend the subtlety of the passage, the question in which (not ἆρα in itself, as held by Hartung) bears the trace of an ironical suspicion of doubtfulness.[6] Besides, ἆρα is never really used for ἆρ' οὐ, although it sometimes seems so.[7] Rückert has mistaken the sense of the whole passage : "If we, although we seek grace with God through Christ, nevertheless continue to sin, etc., do ye think that Christ will then take pleasure in us, greater pleasure than in the Gentiles, and thus strengthen and further us in our sin ?" Against this it may be urged, that Paul has not written εὑρισκόμεθα ; that the comparison with the *Gentiles* implied in καὶ αὐτοί would be unsuitable, for the sin here reproved would be hypocritical *Judaizing ;* and that ver. 18 would not, as is most arbitrarily assumed, give the reason for the μὴ γένοιτο, but, passing over the μὴ γένοιτο and the apodosis, would carry us back to the protasis and prove this latter. The nearest to this erroneous interpretation is that of Beza and Wieseler, who (so also essentially Reithmayr) find expressed here the necessity of the union of sanctification with justification.[8] But the right sense of the passage, as given above, is found in substance, although with several modifications, and in some cases with an incorrect apprehension of the aorist εὑρέθημεν (see above), in Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius,

---

[1] See on Rom. iii. 22, and Lipsius, *Rechtfertigungsl.* p. 112.

[2] See on Rom. iii. 30; 2 Cor. iii. 11; Eph. i. 7.

[3] Comp. iii. 26.

[4] Comp. ver. 4, iii. 26.

[5] Comp. Rom. iii. 20.

[6] Comp. on Acts ii. 17.

[7] *Diss.* II. *in* 2 *Cor.* p. 26.

[8] Comp. ver. 21. It is otherwise, v. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 8.

[9] Hofmann, who explains it, as if Paul had written εἰ δὲ ἐζητοῦμεν (if we, when we became believers, sought, etc.) δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ, εὑρέθημεν κ.τ.λ. (we thereby exhibit ourselves at the same time as sinners). According to Hofmann, the εὑρέθημεν is intended to apply to both members of the sentence, — a forced, artificial view for which the context affords neither right nor reason.

---

[1] Rom. vii. 10 ; 1 Cor. iv. 2, xv. 15 ; 2 Cor. xi. 12.

[2] Vulgate, Beza, Calvin, and many others. So correctly also Lipsius in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1861, p. 73 ff. He, however, improving on Holsten's similar interpretation, thus explains the whole passage : "If we, being born Jews, have, by our seeking after the salvation in Christ, confessed our sinfulness (and consequently, at the same time, the impotence of the law to make us righteous), does it thence follow that Christ, by inviting also us Jews to seek righteousness in Him and not in the law, has led us astray to a life in Gentile impurity?" But this inference does not stand in logical consistency with the protasis, and could not even suggest itself as a false conclusion ; for ἁμαρτίας is assumed to be taken in a different sense from ἁμαρτωλοί,—the latter in the sense of *defectus justitiae*, the former as *vitiositas ethnica*. Holsten also understands ἁμαρτίας as the unfettering of sin in the moral life (comp. v. 13 ; Rom. i. 6 f., *et al.*),—an idea which is here foreign to the context.

[3] Erasmus, Castalio.

[4] de Wette and many others.

[5] Luther.

[6] Schott.

---

[1] Comp. on Matt. i. 20.

[2] 2 Cor. v. 21 ; Acts xiii. 39 ; Rom. iii. 24.

[3] Rom. iii. 4, vi. 2 ; Gal. iii. 21, *et al.*

[4] Which is assumed by Wieseler, Buttmann, Hofmann.

[5] See Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 180 ; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 39 f.

[6] Comp. Buttmann, *ad Plat. Charmid.* 14, ed. Heind.

[7] Herm. *ad Viger.* p. 823 ; Heind. *ad Plat. Theaet.* p. 476 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 216. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 6. 1.

[8] They take the essential sense to be : "If the man who is justified in Christ has sinned, Christ is not to blame for this ; for (ver. 18) the man himself is to blame for the transgression, because he builds again the dominion of sin which He had destroyed." So Wieseler. This interpretation is utterly unsuitable, if ver. 15 ff. is still addressed to Peter. It may be urged also against it, that Paul, by using εὑρέθημεν (instead of εὑρισκόμεθα), would have written in a way both obscure and misleading ; further, that the relapse of the justified man into sin did not at all suggest or presume as probable the conclusion that Christ was to blame for it ; moreover, that the expression ἁμαρτίας διάκονος must assert something of a far stronger and more positive character (namely, sin-*producer*) ; lastly, that ver. 18, taken in Wieseler's sense, would, notwithstanding its carefully-chosen expressions, contain nothing more than an almost meaningless and self-evident thought, in which, moreover, the destruction of the dominion of sin, which has been accomplished by Christ or by the justifying grace of God (Rom. viii. 3), would be attributed to *man* (κατέλυσα).

Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Calvin, Calovius, Estius, Wolf, Wetstein, and others ; also Semler, Koppe, Borger, Flatt, Winer, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Matthias ; several of whom, however, such as the Greek Fathers, Luther, Calovius, Koppe, Usteri, Lachmann, taking the accentuation ἄρα, do not assume any question, which does not alter the essential sense, but does not correspond with the μὴ γένοιτο which follows ; while Hilgenfeld unnecessarily supposes a *breviloquence :* "*then I ask,* Is then Christ," etc. ? — Χριστός] "in whom, yet, we seek to be justified," Bengel. — ἁμαρτ. διάκ.] ἁμαρτ. emphatically prefixed, in contrast to the δικαιωθῆναι : one, through whom *sin* receives service rendered, *sin* is upheld and promoted.[1] The opposite, διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης, 2 Cor. xi. 15.

Ver. 18. Ground assigned for the μὴ γένοιτο : No ! Christ is not a minister of sin ; *for* — and such is the result, Peter, of the course of conduct censured in thee — *if I again build up that which I have pulled down, I show myself as transgressor ;* so that Christ thus by no means appears, according to the state of the case supposed in ver. 17, as the promoter of sin, but the reproach —and that a reproach of *transgression* — falls upon myself alone, as I exhibit myself by my own action. Remark the emphasis, energetically exposing the great personal guilt, which is laid *first* on παραβάτην (in contrast to ἁμαρτίας διάκονος), *then* on ἐμαυτόν (in contrast to Χριστός), and *jointly* on the *juxtaposition* of the two words. In the *building up of that which had been pulled down* Paul depicts the behavior of Peter, in so far as the latter previously, and even still in Antioch (ver. 12), had pronounced the Mosaic law not to be obligatory in respect of justification on the Christian who has his righteousness in Christ and not in the law, and had thus pulled it down as a building thenceforth useless, but subsequently by his Judaizing behavior again represented the law as obligatory for righteousness, and thus, as it were, built up anew the house which had been pulled down.[2] Paul is fond of the figure of building and pulling down.[3] The *first* person veils that, which had happened with Peter *in concreto,* "in the concrete," under the milder form of a general proposition, the subject of which (= one, any one) is individualized by *I.*[4] — ταῦτα] with emphasis : *this,* not anything else or more complete in its place. — παραβάτην] not *sinner* generally, as Wieseler, according to his interpretation of the whole passage, is forced to explain it (see on ver. 17), but *transgressor of the law* (Rom. iv. 15, ii. 25) ; so that, in conformity with the significance of the figure used, νόμου is obviously supplied from the context (vv. 16, 19),—and that as the *Mosaic* law, not as the νόμος τῆς πίστεως, the gospel.[1] But *how far* does he, who reasserts the validity of that law which he had previously as respects justification declared invalid, present himself as a transgressor of the same? Not in so far *as he proves that he had wrongly declared it invalid and abandoned it*,[2] or as he has in the pulling down sinned *against that which is to him right*, as Hofmann interprets it,[3] but, as ver. 19 shows, because the law itself has brought about the freedom of the Christian from the law, in order that he may live to God; consequently he that builds it up again acts in opposition to the law, and thus stands forth as *transgressor*, namely, of the law in its real sense, which cannot desire, but on the contrary rejects, the re-exchanging of the new righteousness for the old.[4] The word is *purposely chosen*, and stands in a *climactic* relation to ἁμαρτωλοί (ver. 17),—the category which includes also the Gentiles without law. — συνιστάνω] *I show*. See Wetstein and Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* iii. 5; Munthe, *Obss.* p. 358; Loesner, p. 248. But Schott explains it as *commendo, laudo*, "I commend, I praise,"[5] making it convey *an ironical reference to the Judaists*, who had boasted of their Judaizing behavior. This idea is not in any way indicated;[6] and the ironical reference must have rather pointed at *Peter*, who, however, had not made a boast of his Judaizing, but had consented to it in a timid and conniving fashion. Hence Bengel's explanation is more subtle; "Petrus voluit commendare se ver. 12 fin.; ejus commendationis tristem Paulus fructum hic mimesi ostendit," "Peter wished to commend himself, ver. 12, at the end; Paul here by a *mimesis* shows the sad fruit of this commendation." But according to the connection, as exhibited above, between ver. 18 and ver. 17, the idea of commendation is so entirely foreign to the passage, that, in fact, ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάνω expresses essentially nothing more than the idea of εὑρέθημεν in ver. 17; bringing into prominence, however, the *self*-presentation, the *self*-proof, which the person concerned practically furnishes in his own case: he establishes *himself* as a transgressor.

---

[1] Luther's gloss : "Whoever desires to become godly by means of works, acts just as if Christ by His ministry, office, preaching, and sufferings, made us first of all sinners who must become godly through the law ; thus is Christ denied, crucified again, slandered, and sin is built up again, which had previously been done away by the preaching of faith."

[2] Comp. Holsten, *z. Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 283.

[3] See Rom. xv. 20 ; 1 Cor. viii. 1, x. 23 ; Eph. ii. 20 f. ; Rom. xiv. 20 ; 2 Cor. v. 1, *et al.* Comp. Talmud, *Berach.* 63. 1, in Wetstein : "jam aedificasti, an destruis ? jam sepem fecisti, an perrumpes ?" "Art thou destroying who hast been building ? wilt thou break through who hast made the hedge ?"

[4] Comp. Rom. vii. 7.

Ver. 19 f., containing the "summa ac medulla Christianismi," "sum and marrow of Christianity" (Bengel), furnishes the confirmation of ver. 18; for which purpose Paul makes use of his own experience[1] with sublime self-assurance and in a way sufficient to shame Peter : *For I* for my own part, to give utterance here to the consciousness of my own experience, apart from the experience of others, *am through the law dead to the law, in order to live to God.* In this view the contrast to Χριστός is not expressed already by this ἐγώ (Hofmann); but only by the ἐγώ of ver. 20. The point confirmatory of ver. 18 lies in διὰ νόμου ; for he, who *through the law* has passed out of the relation to the law which regulated his life, in order to stand in a higher relation, and yet reverts to his legally-framed life, acts *against the law*, παραβάτην ἑαυτὸν συνιστάνει. The νόμος in both cases must be the *Mosaic* law, because otherwise the probative force and the whole point of the passage would be lost ; and because, if Paul had intended νόμου to refer to the *gospel*,[2] he must have added some distinguishing definition [3] The immediate context, that is, the Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι κ.τ.λ. which closely follows (and not ver. 16), supplies precise information how Paul intended the διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον to be understood. By the crucifixion the curse of the law was fulfilled in Christ (iii. 13); and so far Christ died *through the law*, which demanded, and in Christ's death received, the accomplishment of its curse. In one, therefore, who is crucified *with Christ*, the curse of the law is likewise fulfilled, so that in virtue of his ethical fellowship in the death of Jesus he knows himself to be dead διὰ νόμου,[4] and consequently at the same time dead *to the law* (comp. Rom. vii. 4); because, now that the law has accomplished in his case its rights, the bond of union which joined him to the law is broken ; for κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νομοῦ, ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα, "we have been delivered from the law, being dead to that wherein we were held," Rom. vii. 6. So, in all essential points, Chrysostom[5] and others, Zachariae, Usteri (Schott wavers in his view, Rückert still more so).[6] This is the only interpretation which keeps closely to the context, and is therefore to be preferred to the views of others, who understand διὰ νόμου to refer to the *Messianic contents* of the law and the prophets, by which Paul had been induced to abandon the law,[7] and of others still, who find the *insufficiency* of the law for salvation expressed.[8] Neither is there suggested in the context *the* reference to the pedagogic functions of the law, iii. 24, which is found by Beza,[1] Calvin, Wolf, and others; also by Matthies, who, however, understands *διά* as *quite through.*[2] De Wette thus explains the pedagogic thought which he supposes to be intended: "By my having thoroughly lived in the law and experienced its character in my own case, I have become conscious of the need of a higher moral life, the life in the Spirit; and through the regeneration of my inner man I have made my way from the former to the latter." So, also, in all essential points, Wieseler, although the *usus paedagogicus*, "pedagogical use," of the law does not *produce* regeneration and thereby moral liberation from its yoke (which, however, *διὰ νόμου* must affirm), but only awakens the longing after it (Rom. vii. 21. ff.), and prepares the ground for justification and sanctification. The inner deliverance from the the yoke of the law takes place *διὰ πνεύματος* (v. 18; Rom. viii. 2). A clear commentary on our passage is Rom. vii. 4–6. — *ἵνα Θεῷ ζήσω*] *that I might live to God*, that my *life* (brought about by that *ἀπέθανον*) might be dedicated *to God*, and should not therefore again serve the *νόμος*,[3]—which is the case with him who *ἃ κατέλυσε ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομεῖ* (ver. 18).[4] — *Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι*] Situation in which he finds himself through that *διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον*, and accompanying information how this event took place in him. Corresponding with this, afterwards in ver. 20, *ζῶ . . . Χριστός* contains information *as to the way* in which *ἵνα Θεῷ ζήσω* was realized in him. *With Christ I am crucified*, thus expressing the consciousness of moral fellowship, brought about by faith, in the atoning death of Christ,—a subjective fellowship, in which the believer knows that the curse of the law is accomplished on himself because it is accomplished on Christ,[5] and at the same time that his pre-Christian ethical state of life, which was subject to the law, is put an end to (*νομῷ ἀπέθανον*).[6] Observe also how in this very passage it is evident from the whole context, that *σύν* in *συνεσταύρ.* and in the corresponding expressions[7] denotes not the mere *typical character* of Christ or the *resemblance* to Him (Baumgarten-Crusius), but the actual *fellowship*, which, as accomplished and existing in the consciousness of faith, is matter of real experience. On the *perfect*, which expresses the blessed feeling of the *continuance* of what had taken place, comp. vi. 14. Here it is the continuance of the liberation of the moral personal life from the law, which was begun by the crucifixion with Christ.

---

[1] Koppe, Matthies.

[2] Ambrosius, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Vorstius, Baumgarten, Zachariae, Rosenmüller, Borger, Usteri, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Ewald.

[3] The application to be made of the general proposition is said to be this: "Whosoever desires and seeks to become righteous in Christ would not do so, unless he recognized the matter in which he sinned as a *breach of the law* which *he has again to make good*, and that which he does to make it good is *self-confession as a transgressor*." This forced perversion should have been precluded by the very consideration that καταλύειν in reference to the law cannot be understood in the sense of breaking it, like λύειν τὸ σάββατον, John v. 18 (comp. vii. 26), but only in the sense of Matt. v. 17, according to which, of course, the *building up again* is no *making good again*. Comp. on καταλύειν τοὺς νόμους, Polyb. iii. 8. 2.

[4] Comp. Rom. iii. 31. See the fuller statement at ver. 19. Comp. Chrysostom and Theophylact (αὐτὸς γὰρ . . . ὁ νόμος . . . με ὡδήγησε πρὸς τὴν πίστιν καὶ ἔπεισεν ἀφεῖναι αὐτόν, "for the law itself led me to faith and persuaded me to break it"). Bengel, moreover, well says: "Vocabulum horribile, legis studiosioribus," "a horrible term to those more eager for the law."

[5] 2 Cor. iii. 1, v. 12, x. 12.

[6] Schott should not have appealed to the form συνιστάνω. Both forms have the same signification. Hesychius: συνιστάνειν, ἐπαινεῖν, φανεροῦν, βεβαιοῦν, παρατιθέναι. Only the form συνιστάνω is less frequent and later, Polyb. iv. 5, 6, xxviii. 17. 6, xxxii. 15. 8; 2 Cor. iii. 1, v. 12.

---

[1] Not—as Olshausen and Baumgarten-Crusius hold, contrary to the context—designating himself as *representative of believers generally*.

[2] Jerome, Ambrose, Erasmus, Luther, Vatablus, Zeger, Vorstius, Bengel, Michaelis, Koppe, Morus, Rosenmüller, Borger, Vater.

[3] Rom. iii. 27, viii. 2, ix. 31; comp. 1 Cor. ix. 21.

[4] Not, therefore, as Hermann interprets, διὰ νόμου ὃν κατέλυσα, "through the law rejected by myself."

[5] He indeed also specifies the interpretation, by which νόμου is understood of the *gospel*, as well as the view, which takes νόμου of the *Mosaic* law, but elucidates the relation of διά by Deut. xviii. 18. He nevertheless evidently gives the preference to the interpretation given above.

[6] Comp. Lipsius, *l.c.* p. 81 f.; Weiss. *bibl. Theol.* p. 363; Möller on de Wette, p. 50.

[7] Theodoret, Corn. à Lapide, Hammond, Grotius, and others ; also Baumgarten-Crusius.

[8] As Winer, "*lex legem sustulit ;* ipsa lex, cum non posset mihi salutem impertire, mei me juris fecit atque a suo imperio liberavit," "the *law removed the law ;* the law itself, since it could not impart salvation to me, made me my own master, and freed me from its dominion." Olshausen, Matthias, and likewise Hofmann, who understand it to refer to the knowledge acquired through the law, that it was impossible to attain righteousness in the way of the

Ver. 20. *Ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός*] The comma which is

---

law,—which righteousness, therefore, could only be attained by means of faith; comp. Hilgenfeld, Reithmayr, also Ewald, whose interpretation would seem to call for *διὰ τὸν νόμον*.

[1] "*Lex enim terrens conscientiam ad Christum adducit*, qui unus vere efficit, ut moriamur legi, quoniam nos justificando tollit conscientiae terrores," "for the law by terrifying the conscience leads to Christ, who only effects it that we die to the law, since by justifying us He removes the terrors of conscience."

[2] "Having passed quite through the law, I have it behind me, and am no longer bound to it."

[3] *ἵνα Θεῷ ζήσω* is therefore not (with Chrysostom, Cajetanus, Calvin, and others) to be joined to *Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι*; for it essentially belongs to the completeness of the thought introduced by *γάρ*.

[4] Comp., moreover, Rom. vi. 11.

[5] Comp. iii. 13 (*διὰ νόμου ἀπέθανον*).

[6] Comp. Rom. vi. 6, vii. 4, and on Col. ii. 20.

[7] Rom. vi. 8; Col. ii. 12, 20, *et al.*

usually placed after ζῶ δὲ is correctly expunged by Lachmann, Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Tischendorf, Wieseler, Hofmann; for, if ζῶ . . . ἐγώ were not to be conjoined, ἀλλά must have stood before οὐκέτι. The second δὲ is our *but indeed* after a negative,[1] and ζῶ and ζῇ are on both occasions emphatically prefixed: *alive however no longer am I, but alive indeed is Christ in me;* whereby the new relation of *life* is forcibly contrasted to the previously expressed relation *of death* (Χριστῷ συνεστ.). After the crucifixion of Christ followed His new life; he, therefore, who is crucified with Christ, thenceforth *lives* also with Him; his whole pre-Christian moral personality is, in virtue of that fellowship of death, no longer in life (ὁ παλαιὸς αὐτοῦ ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη, Rom. vi. 6), and Christ is the principle of life in him. This change is brought about by faith (see the sequel), inasmuch as in the believer, according to the representation here given of Paul's own experience, it is no longer the individual personality that is the agent of life,[2] but Christ, who is present in him (through the Spirit, Rom. viii. 9 f.; Eph. iii. 16 f.), and works, determines, and rules everything in him, ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός: The mind of Christ is in him (1 Cor. ii. 16), the heart of Christ beats in him (Phil. i. 8), and Christ's power is effectual in him. [See Note XLI., p. 98.] Thereby is the proof of the words ἵνα Θεῷ ζήσω rightly given.[3] — ὃ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκὶ κ.τ.λ.] Explanation of what has just been said, ζῶ . . . Χριστός: *but that which I now live in the flesh, I live in faith on*, etc. This explanation is placed by δέ in formal contradistinction to the preceding apparent paradox. The emphasis, however, lies on νῦν, *now*, namely, *since the beginning of my Christian condition of life*, so that a glance is thrown back to the time before the Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι, and νῦν corresponds with οὐκέτι. Νῦν is often understood[4] in contrast not with the pre-Christian life, but with the future life after death.[5] A reference of this kind is, however, entirely foreign to the context, does not harmonize with the emphasis which is laid on νῦν by its position, and is by no means required by ἐν σαρκί; for this addition to ζῶ is made by Paul simply with a view to indicate that after his conversion the material form of his life remained the same, although its ethical nature had become something entirely different. — ἐν σαρκί] denotes life *in the natural human phenomenal form of the body consisting of flesh.* The context does *not* convey any reference to the *ethical* character of the σάρξ (as *sedes peccati*, "the seat of sin").[6] — ἐν πίστει] not *per fidem*, "by faith,"[7] but, corresponding to ἐν σαρκί, *in faith;* so that faith—and indeed (comp. i. 16) the faith in the great sum and substance of the revelation received, in the Son of God[8] — is the specific element in which my life moves and acts and is developed. It is prefixed emphatically, in contrast to the entirely different pre-Christian sphere of life, which was the νόμος. — τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με κ.τ.λ.] points out the special historical fact of salvation, which is the subject-matter of the faith in the Son of God, giving impulse to this new life.[1] Καί is explanatory, adding the *practical proof* of the love. Observe also the μέ and ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ (see on i. 4) as expressive of the conscious and assured *fiducia* in the *fides*.[2]—Lastly, the *construction* is such, that ὁ is the accusative of the object to ζῶ, and the whole runs on in connection : *the life which I live, I live*, etc.[3] The interpretation : *quod vero attinet, quod*, "which, indeed, is of importance that," etc. (Winer), is indeed grammatically admissible,[4] in so far as ὁ is likewise retained as the accusative of the object ; but it needlessly injures the flow of the discourse.

---

[1] Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 171.

[2] "Mortuus est *Saulus*," "Saul is dead," Erasmus.

[3] See on Rom. vi. 10.

[4] As by Erasmus, Grotius (adhuc), Rückert, Usteri, Schott, following Augustine and Theodoret.

[5] Rather: *after the* παρουσία, "or appearing of Christ."

[6] Comp. Phil. i. 22; 2 Cor. x. 3.

[7] Chrysostom, Beza, and others.

[8] Notice the anarthrous πίστει, and then the article affixed to the more precise definition.

Ver. 21. Negative side, opposed to an antagonistic Judaism, of the life which Paul (from ver. 19) has described as his own. By this negative, with the grave reason assigned for it, εἰ γάρ κ.τ.λ., the perverse conduct of Peter is completely condemned. — *I do not annul* (as is done by again asserting the validity of the law) *the grace of God* (which has manifested itself through the atoning death of Christ). — ἀθετῶ] as in iii. 15, Luke vii. 30, 1 Cor. i. 19, 1 Tim. v. 12, Heb. x. 28 : *make of none effect ;* see the sequel. It is here the *annulling*, practically involved in the Judaistic courses, of the grace of God in Christ, which is in fact rendered inoperative and cannot make righteous, if righteousness is furnished by the *law*. The *rejection* of grace (Vulgate and others, *abjicio*) which is involved in this, is a *practical* rejection.[5] As to ἀθετεῖν generally, which does not occur until after Polybius, see Schweigh. *Lex. Polyb.* p. 12. — εἰ γάρ κ.τ.λ.] justifies what has just been said, οὐκ ἀθετῶ. — διὰ νόμου] *through the law*, namely, as the institute which brings about justification by virtue of the works done in harmony with it.[6] This is emphatically prefixed, so that Χριστός corresponds in the apodosis. — δωρεάν] not : *without result* (Erasmus, *Paraphr.*, Piscator), a meaning which it never has either in classical authors (in whom it occurs in the sense of *gratis* only) or in the LXX., but : *without reason, without cause.*[7] Chrysostom justly says : περιττὸς ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θάνατος, "the death of Christ would be superfluous," which was the very *act* of the *grace* which desired to justify men. This death would have taken place *unnecessarily ;* it would have been, as it were, an *act of superfluity*,[8] if that which it was intended to effect were attainable by way of the *law*. Erasmus aptly remarks, "est autem ratiocinatio *ab impossibili*," "it is, however, arguing from what is impossible." Observe the *exclusive* expression of the clause assigning the reason of *οὐκ ἀθετῶ*, which allows of no *half-and-half division* of justification between law and grace.

---

[1] Comp. Rom. viii. 37 ; Eph. v. 2.

[2] Luther well says, "Hae voces : dilexit *me*, plenissimae sunt fidei, et qui hoc breve pronomen *me* illa fide dicere et sibi applicare posset, qua Paulus, etiam futurus esset optimus disputator una cum Paulo contra legem," "These words, 'Loved *me*,' are most full of security, and he who could utter and apply to himself this short pronoun *me* in the faith wherein Paul did, would be the best disputant with Paul against the law." But this faith is not the *fides formata* (Catholics, including Bisping and Reithmayr), although it is the *source* of Christian love and Christian life.

[3] See Bernhardy, p. 106 ; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 393 f.; Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 302.

[4] See on Rom. vi. 10.

[5] So that ἡ χάρις οὐκέτι γίνεται χάρις, Rom. xi. 6.

[6] Comp. on iii. 11.

[7] As 1 Sam. xix. 5, Ps. xxxiv. 8 (not Job i. 9) : comp. John xv. 25 ; Ecclus. xx. 21, xxix. 6 f.; Ignat. *Trall.* 10, δωρεὰν οὖν ἀποθνήσκω, "I do not die in vain."

[8] Comp. Holsten.

Note.—Paul is discreet enough to say nothing as to the impression which his speech made on Peter. Its candor, resolution, and striking force of argument would, however, be the less likely to miss their aim in the case of Peter, seeing that the latter was himself convinced of Christian freedom (Acts xv. 7 ff.), and had *played the hypocrite* in Antioch only by connivance from fear of men (ver. 13). But as, according to this view, an opposition of principle between the two apostles cannot be conceded (contrary to the view of Baur and his followers), we must abstain from assuming that this occurrence at Antioch had any lasting and far-reaching *consequences;* for it simply had reference to a *moral* false step taken in opposition to Peter's own better judgment, and the scandal arising therefrom. It was therefore so essentially of a *personal* nature, that, if known at all by Luke, it might well have remained unmentioned in Acts—considering the more comprehensive historical destination of that work—without suggesting any suspicion that the absence of mention arose from any *intentional concealment* (comp. on Acts xv.). Such a concealment is but one of the numberless dishonest artifices of which the author of Acts has been accused, ever since certain persons have thought that they recognized in our epistle "the mutely eloquent accuser of the Book of Acts" (Schwegler), which is alleged to throw "a veil of concealment" over the occurrences at Jerusalem and Antioch (Baur, Paulus, I. p. 148, ed. 2).

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

XXX. Ver. 1. *πάλιν ἀνέβην.*

Sieffert, while agreeing with Meyer as to the identification of this visit with that in Acts xv., shows that Meyer's argument as to any discrepancy between this epistle and the account in Acts is based on the assumption that Paul is still occupied with the proof that he had not learned his gospel from the other apostles—a proof which was finished in ver. 24 of the preceding chapter. Here he cites two other incidents in his life, showing his equal standing as an apostle. Hence there was no need for any allusion to a second visit. Baur especially uses this seeming discrepancy to assail the historical accuracy of the Book of Acts. Sanday well remarks: "Discrepancies greater than any that appear here may be observed in the accounts of events separated from their record by but a small interval of time and attested by numerous witnesses . . . So shallow and slight is that house of cards which forms one of the most imposing structures of modern negative criticism." The full investigation of the subject belongs to the exposition of Acts.

XXXI. Ver. 1. *καὶ Τίτον.*

There should be no difficulty in regarding Titus as belonging to the "certain others" of Acts xv. He is mentioned here to the exclusion of the rest, in view of what follows in ver. 3.

XXXII. Ver. 2. *κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν.*

Sieffert considers Meyer's inference that the account requires the general discussion to be first, incorrect. So also Lightfoot.

XXXIII. Ver. 5. *ψευδάδελφοι.*

Sieffert substitutes a long note beginning: "The continuous agreement between Gal. ii. 3–5 and Acts xv. 1 sqq., which has been cited already at ver. 1 for the general identity of the journey of Paul to Jerusalem mentioned in both places, decides at once against the assumption of Meyer, that as the accounts in Gal. ii. and Acts xv. relate to different occurrences respecting the same journey of Paul, so the two passages, Gal. ii. 2 (*ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς*) 3–5 and Acts xv. 4, 12 report two distinct matters, both of which, nevertheless, could have occurred at the same visit of the apostle to Jerusalem. But there is just as little foundation for regarding the account of Acts excluded by that of Paul, unless they are both, especially that of Paul, misunderstood, and the distinction between their purpose ignored; that of Paul being directed to the proof of his personal dignity, and that of Acts to the historical exhibition of the general ecclesiastical development. On the contrary, it is manifest that the account in Acts is in every respect adapted to complete the brief declarations of Paul. Thus while these declarations contain no indication as to whether Paul had only one or several conferences with the church, the account of the latter is furnished by Acts."

XXXIV. Ver. 8. *Ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας.*

"By this is not meant the call to the apostolate (Fritzsche), or the mere equipment and making fit (Schott, Meyer, Wieseler), but the entire efficacious operation of God for the successful execution of the apostolic calling (cf. Winer, Usteri, de Wette, Hofmann), but it is not to be limited to the gift of the results (Baur)." Sieffert.

XXXV. Ver. 10. *τῶν πτωχῶν.*

The "*poor*" are Christianized Jews, mainly in Palestine (cf. Rom. xv. 26, 27; 1 Cor. xvi. 3), but not necessarily confined thereto. In going to the Gentiles, such Jewish converts from the diaspora as would be found destitute were to be cared for. Cf. Eadie.

XXXVI. Ver. 10. Entire Verse.

"The private conference of Paul with the pillars of the church here reported is not mentioned in Acts. It may be readily inferred that with this account the words, Acts xv. 6, *συνήχθησαν δε οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἰδεῖν περὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτου* are to be combined, as, *e.g.*, Ebrard and Pfleiderer do in different ways. By including in the *δοκοῦντες* the elders present with Paul (Ebrard), or believing that they are not directly excluded by the wording (Pfleiderer), they find an account indicated of a private conference with the apostles and elders entirely corresponding to that in Acts. Ebrard, however, regards this as only a preliminary conference, and not until after the controversy had increased (ver. 7) does Peter enter the assembly, in which, according to ver. 12, *πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος*, and, according to ver. 22, *ὅλη ἡ ἐκκλησία* is present; while Pfleiderer believes that the transactions according to Acts took place in only a narrow circle, and only the result was erroneously represented as a formal resolution of the church. But the latter view is excluded by the fact that already in ver. 12 the church (πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος) is regarded as present. Even the former view can scarcely be supported, as the silence of the entire body that follows the address of Peter is manifestly in opposition to the idea of the occurrence of much controversy after the coming together of the apostles and elders, as in them the entire body is present and participates. All, therefore, that is related in Acts xv. 6–29 refers to the only congregational meeting conducted by apostles and elders, while that which is referred to Gal. ii. 3–5 belongs to the public transactions. After this there remains in the report given in Acts no room for a private conference; this must be referred to the time of the informal preliminary conference, Acts xv. 4, since, according to the representation of Paul, its temporal priority is not only possible, but even probable (cf. v. 2). Accordingly, if the private conference, Gal. ii. 6–10, is entirely passed by in Acts as outside of its historical purpose, then what is reported in Acts xv. cannot be excluded by the former; for otherwise the chief antagonisms between the two accounts would have respect to the relation and position of the apostolic pillars. But such is not the case. For not only the recognition of Paul's commission to the heathen by the original apostles, but also their essential doctrinal agreement with Paul in respect to various interests and offices are indicated by the public addresses and resolutions of Acts xv." (Sieffert).

XXXVII. Ver. 11. κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην κ.τ.λ.

Meyer's objection to Bengel's interpretation does not seem valid. What if the question be left unanswered as to the persons from whom the condemnation proceeded? The act carried with it its own condemnation. So Alford, Lightfoot, Sanday, Sieffert. Meyer is supported by Ellicott, Eadie, and Riddle in the American Lange. The argument that the condemnation must have been public, or a public rebuke would not have been given, does not meet the case, since the public offence required a public protest on the part of Paul.

XXXVIII. Ver. 15. ἁμαρτωλοί.

ἁμαρτωλοί is used in preference to ἔθνη, not without a shade of irony, as better enforcing St. Paul's argument (Lightfoot).

XXXIX. Ver. 16. εἰδότες δὲ ὅτι κ.τ.λ.

According to Sieffert, ver. 16 forms a new sentence, and the εἰδότες is a participial foundation to the καὶ ἡμεῖς. The knowledge, too, is not merely discursive, but that which is rooted in the sense of guilt and the consciousness of communion with Christ.

XL. Ver. 16. Ἐὰν μή κ.τ.λ.

The *obedientia activa* must not be excluded from the meritorious cause of justification, as the remark of Meyer would imply. "By his active obedience Christ most exactly fulfilled the divine law in our stead, in order that penitent sinners, applying to themselves, by true faith, this vicarious fulfilment of the law, might be accounted righteous before God the judge, Gal. iv. 4, 5; Matt. v. 17; Rom. x. 4" (Hollaz).

XLI. Ver. 20. *τῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ.*

"Wondrous words! I am so identified with Him, that His death is my death. When He was crucified, I was crucified with Him. I am so much one with Him under law, and in suffering and death, that when He died to the law I died to the law" (Eadie). The application of this to the argument against Peter is well presented by Brenz: "He who believes in Christ is incorporated with Christ by faith, and becomes His member. But to him who is a member of Christ's body belong also all the blessings of Christ which He Himself has acquired by the cross and death. What then has he acquired? First, Christ, by His cross, broke down and removed the partition between Jews and Gentiles, and made of the two one people, *i.e.*, by His own blood He so blotted out the law of Moses that there is in Christ no distinction between Jews and Gentiles. When, therefore, by faith I am incorporated with Christ, I am participant of this blessing, so that even though I do not live according to the political law of Moses, nevertheless I have been accepted by God for Christ's sake. Secondly, Christ by His death and blood removed the handwriting which was against us, Col. 2. This handwriting is the conscience of sin, which is written in our heart by the law, manifesting sins and condemning us. When, then, I am incorporated with Christ by faith, I become participant of this blessing, that the handwriting of my conscience does not pertain at all to me, because it has been blotted out by the blood of Christ, nor has it any longer any authority or strength, because its seals have been removed by Christ's cross, and its letters have been blotted out by Christ's blood. This is verily to be crucified with Christ."

CHAPTER III.

VER. 1. After ἐβάσκανε Elz. (and Matth.) has τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι, against decisive evidence. An explanatory addition from v. 7. — ἐν ὑμῖν] is wanting in A B C ℵ, min., and several vss. and Fathers, and is omitted by Lachm. But not being required, and not understood, how easily might it be passed over! There was no reason in the text for attaching it as a gloss, least of all to κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς προεγρ. (as conjectured by Schott), for these words were in fact perfectly clear *by themselves*. Justly defended also by Reiche.—Ver. 8. ἐνευλογηθήσονται] Elz. gives εὐλογ., against decisive testimony [ℵ A B C D E]. In Acts iii. 25 also, ἐνευλογ. is exchanged in several authorities for the usual simple form. — Ver. 10. According to decisive evidence [ℵ A B C D E F G], ὅτι is to be adopted (with Griesb., Lachm., Scholz, and Tisch.) before ἐπικατάρατος. — Ver. 12. After αὐτά Elz. has ἄνθρωπος, against decisive testimony. Addition from the LXX., Lev. xviii. 5; Rom. x. 5. — Ver. 13. Instead of γέγρ. γάρ, read, on preponderating testimony, with Lachm. and Tisch., ὅτι γέγραπται approved by Griesb. The former arose from ver. 10. — Ver. 17. After Θεοῦ, Elz., Scholz, Reiche, have εἰς Χριστόν, in opposition to A B C ℵ, min., several vss. and Fathers. Added as a gloss, in order, after ver. 16, to make it evident from ver. 24 *what* covenant is intended, although this is obvious from the context, and the addition was therefore by no means necessary (as maintained by Ewald and Wieseler). In the sequel, ἔτη is (with Griesb., Lachm., Scholz, Tisch.) to be placed *after* the number, according to decisive evidence [ℵ A B C D E F G]. — Ver. 19. προσετέθη] Griesb. and Scholz (following Mill and Bengel) read ἐτέθη. Not sufficiently attested by D* F G and a few min., vss., and Fathers; and the compound verb appeared to conflict with ver. 15. — Instead of ᾧ ἐπήγγελται, only L and many min., along with some Fathers, read ὃ ἐπήγγ. A reading arising from the fact that ᾧ was not understood. — Ver. 21. τοῦ Θεοῦ] is wanting only in B, Clar. Germ. Ambrosiast. (bracketed by Lachm.), and is therefore so decisively attested that it cannot be regarded as an explanatory addition. The self-evident meaning and the previous reference *without* τοῦ Θεοῦ (see ver. 16 ff.) led to the omission. — Ver. 21. ἂν ἐκ νόμου ἦν] Many variations. F G have merely ἐκ νόμου;[1] D*, Damasc, ἐκ νόμου ἦν; A B C, Cyr., ἐκ νόμου (B, ἐν νόμῳ) ἂν ἦν. In default of internal evidence, the latter is, with Lachm., Tisch., Schott, to be preferred as the best attested (comp. ℵ, ἐκ νόμου ἦν ἄν). The omission of ἄν arose from the ἦν following, just as easily as the omission of ἦν from the following ἤ. The *Recepta* is to be considered as the restoration of the original ἄν in a wrong place. — Ver. 23. συγκεκλεισμένοι] A B D* F G ℵ, 31, Clem. (once) Cyr. Damasc. read συγκλειομένοι. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm., Scholz, Schott [Tisch., 1872]. The *Recepta*, specially defended by Reiche, is an ancient emendation of the not-understood present participle. — Ver. 28. εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] A has ἐστε Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ; and ℵ, ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰ. But εἷς was very easily suppressed by the preceding ὑμεῖς, and then ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ was altered in accordance with the beginning of ver. 29. The reading ἕν instead of εἷς in F G and several vss., also Vulgate, It., and Fathers, is an interpretation. — Ver. 29. καί] is wanting in A B C D E ℵ, 89**, and a few vss. and many Fathers, and is expunged by Lachmann, Tisch., and Schott ; justly, because it was inserted for the purpose of connection.

---

[1] Which Buttmann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 488, considers as probably the original reading.

Contents.—Paul now begins to unfold to his readers that righteousness comes not from the law, but from faith. With this view, after having expressed censure and surprise, he refers in the first place to their own experience, namely, to their reception of the Holy Spirit (vv. 1–5). He then passes on to Abraham, who had been justified by faith, and of whom believers were the sons who, in conformity with Scripture, were to enjoy with Abraham the blessing announced to him (vv. 6–9). For those that trust in works of the law are cursed, and by the law can no man be justified (vv. 10–12). It is Christ who by His atoning death has freed us from the curse of the law, in order that this blessing should reach the Gentiles through Christ, and the promised Holy Spirit should be received through faith (vv. 13, 14). But the covenant of promise concluded with Abraham, which moreover applied not merely to Abraham, but also to Christ, cannot be abrogated by the law which arose long after (vv. 15–18). This leads the apostle to the question as to the destination of the law, which he briefly answers in ver. 19 positively, and then in vv. 20–23 negatively, to the effect that the law is not opposed to the promises. Before the period of faith, the law had the office of a παιδαγωγός in reference to Christ ; but after the appearance of faith this relation came to an end, for faith brought believers to the sonship of God, because by baptism fellowship with Christ was established, and thereupon all distinctions apart from Christ vanished away (vv. 23–28). And this fellowship with Christ includes the being children of Abraham and heirs of the promises.

Ver. 1. *O irrational Galatians!* With this address of *severe censure* Paul turns again to his readers, after the account of his meeting with Peter ; for his reprimand to the latter (ii. 15–21) had indeed so pithily and forcibly presented the intermixture of Judaism with faith as *absurd*, that the excited apostle, in re-addressing readers who had allowed themselves to be carried away to that same incongruous intermingling, could not have seized on any predicate more suitable or more naturally suggested. The more inappropriate, therefore, is the idea of Jerome,[1] who discovered in this expression a *natural* weakness of understanding *peculiar to the nation.* But the testimony borne on the other hand by Themist.[2] to the Galatian *readiness to learn*, and *acuteness* of understanding—the consciousness of which would make the reproach all the more keenly felt—is also[3] to be set aside as irrelevant.[4] — τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανε] τίς conveys his astonishment at the great ascendency which the perversion had succeeded in attaining, and by way of emphatic contrast the words *τίς ὑμᾶς* are placed together : *Who* hath bewitched *you*, before whose eyes, etc. ?[1] — *βασκαίνω* (from *βάζω̃*, to speak) means here *to cast a spell upon* (*mala lingua nocere*, Virg. *Ecl.* vii. 28), *to bewitch by words, to enchant*[2]—a *strong* mode of describing the perversion, quite in keeping with the indignant feeling which could hardly conceive it possible.[3] Hence the word is not to be explained, with Chrysostom and his followers : *who has envied you*, that is, your previous happy condition?—although this signification is of very frequent occurrence, usually indeed with the *dative*,[4] but also with the *accusative.*[5] — *οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς 'Ιησ. Χρ. προεγράφη ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσταυρωμένος*] This fact, which ought to have guarded the Galatians from being led away to a Judaism opposed to the doctrine of atonement, and which makes their apostasy the more culpable, justifies the question of surprise, of which the words themselves form part ; hence the mark of interrogation is to be placed after *ἐσταυρ.* — *κατ' ὀφθαλμούς*] *before the eyes.* See examples in Wetstein.[6]—*προεγράφη*] is explained by most expositors, either as *antea*, "previously," *depictus est*, "portrayed,"[7] or *palam*, *depictus est*, "openly portrayed,"[8] with which Hofmann compares the brazen serpent in the wilderness, and Caspari[9] even mixes up a stigmatization with the marks of Christ's wounds, which Paul, according to vi. 17, is supposed to have borne on his own body. But these interpretations are opposed not only by the words *ἐν ὑμῖν* (see below), but also by the *usus loquendi.* For, however frequent may be the occurrence of *γράφειν* in the sense of *to paint*; this signification can by no means be proved as to *προγράφειν.*[10] The Greek expression for *showing how to paint*, *tracing out*, in the sense of a picture given to copy, is *ὑπογράφειν.* Following Elsner and others, Morus, Flatt, and Schott understand it as *palam scriptus est*, "was openly described :"[11] "ita Christus vobis est ob oculos palam descriptus, *quasi in tabula vobis praescriptus*," "Christ was so openly described to you, *as though set before you on a panel*," Morus. This is inconsistent with *ἐν ὑμῖν*, for these words cannot be joined with *ἐσταυρωμένος* (see below) ; and Schott's interpretation : *in animis vestris*, "in your minds"—so that what was said figuratively by *οἷς . . . προεγρ.* is now more exactly defined *sermone proprio*, "in the strict sense," by *ἐν ὑμῖν* — makes the *ἐν ὑμῖν* appear simply as something quite foreign and unsuitable in the connection, by which the figure is

---

[1] Comp. also Erasmus, and Spanheim *ad Callim. H. in Del.* 184, p. 439.

[2] *Or.* 23, in Wetstein, on i. 6.

[3] Notwithstanding Hofmann.

[4] Comp. Luke xxiv. 25 ; Tit. iii. 3.

---

[1] Comp. v. 7.

[2] Bos, *Exercitatt.* p. 173 f., and Wetstein.

[3] Comp. βασκανία, *fascinatio*, sorcery, Plat. *Phaed.* p. 95 B ; βάσκανος, Plut. *Symp.* v. 7 ; ἀβάσκαντος, *unenchanted.*

[4] Kühner, II. p. 247 ; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 462 ; Piers. *ad Herodian.* p. 470 f.

[5] In Ecclus. xiv. 6, Herodian. ii. 4. 11.

[6] Comp. κατ' ὄμματα, Soph. *Ant.* 756, and on ii. 11.

[7] Chrysostom, Luther, Erasmus, Castalio, Beza, Cornelius à Lapide, and others ; also Hilgenfeld, Reithmayr.

[8] Most modern expositors, following Calvin ; including Winer, Paulus, Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Reiche, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, Holsten.

[9] In the *Strassb. Beitr.* 1854, p. 211 f.

[10] Not even in Arist. *Av.* 450. See Rettig in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 97.

[11] 1 Macc. x. 36 ; Lucian, *Tim.* 51 ; Plut. *Mor.* p. 408 D, Demetr. 46, Camill. 11 *et al.* On this meaning is based the interpretation of Ambrose, Augustine, and Lyra, "He was *proscribed*, that is, condemned," which is indeed admissible so far as usage goes (Polyb. xxxii. 21, 12, xxxii. 22, 1 ; Plut. *Brut.* 27), but quite unsuitable to the context. Comp. Vulgate : *proscriptus est*, instead of which, however, Lachmann has *praescriptus est.*

marred. [See Note XLII., p. 159.] In the two other passages where Paul uses προγράφειν (Rom. xv. 4 ; Eph. iii. 3) it means *to write beforehand*, so that πρό has a *temporal* and not a *local* signification ;[1] nor is the meaning different in Jude 4 (see Huther). And so it is to be taken here.[2] Paul represents his previous *preaching* of Christ as crucified to the Galatians figuratively as a writing, which he had *previously written* (προεγράφη) *in their hearts* (ἐν ὑμῖν).[3] In this view κατ' ὀφθαλμούς is that trait of the figure, by which the personal *oral* instruction is characterized : Paul formerly wrote Christ *before their eyes* in their hearts, when he *stood before them and preached the word of the cross, which through his preaching impressed itself on their hearts.* By his vivid illustration he recalls the fact to his readers, who had just been so misled by a preaching altogether different (i. 6). With no greater boldness than in 2 Cor. iii. 2 f., he has *moulded* the figure *according to the circumstances of the case*, as he is wont to do in figurative language ;[4] but this does not warrant a pressing of the figure to prove traits physically imcompatible.[5] Jerome and others[6] have indeed correctly kept to the meaning *olim scribere*, "of writing formerly,"[7] but have quite inappropriately referred it to the *prophecies of the O. T.* : "quibus ante oculos praedictio fuit Christi in crucem sublati," "before whose eyes there has been a prediction of Christ raised upon the cross," Hermann. Apart from the circumstance that the *precise* mode of death by *crucifixion* is not mentioned in the prophetical utterances, this would constitute a ground for surprise on the part of the apostle of a nature much too general, not founded on the personal relation of Paul to his readers, and therefore by no means adequate as a motive ; and, in fact, vv. 2–4 carry back their memory to *the time, when* Paul *was at work among them.* — ἐν ὑμῖν] is not, with Grotius, Usteri, and others, to be set aside as a Hebrew pleonasm (אֲשֶׁר בָּכֶם), but is to be understood as *in animis vestris*, "in your minds,"[8] and belongs to προεγράφη ; in which case, however, the latter cannot mean either *palam pictus*, "openly portrayed," or *palam scriptus est*, "openly written," because then ἐν ὑμῖν would involve a *contradictio in adjecto*, "contradiction in what is added," and would not be a fitting epexegesis of οἷς,[9] for the *depicting* and the *placarding* cannot take place otherwise than on something external. To take ἐν ὑμῖν as *among you* and connect it with προεγρ., would yield not a *strengthening* of οἷς (as de Wette holds), but an empty addition, from which Reiche and Wieseler also obtain nothing more than a purport obvious of itself.[10] On the other hand, Hofmann hits upon the expedient of dividing the words οἷς . . . ἐσταυρ. into *two independent* sentences : (1) *Before whose eyes is Jesus Christ ;* (2) *as the Crucified One, He has been freely and publicly delineated among you.* But, apart from the linguistically incorrect view of προεγράφη, this dismemberment would give to the language of the passage a violently abrupt form, which is the more intolerable, as Paul does not dwell further on the asyndetically introduced προεγρ. ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσταυρ. or subjoin to it any more particular statement, but, on the contrary, in ver. 2 brings forward asyndetically a new thought. Instead of introducing it abruptly in a way so liable to misapprehension, he would have subjoined προεγράφη — if it was not intended to belong to οἷς — in some simple form by γάρ or ὅτι or ὅς or ὅσγε. Without any impropriety, he might, on the other hand, figuratively represent that he who preaches Christ to others *writes* (not *placards* or *depicts*) Christ before their eyes in their hearts. Most expositors connect ἐν ὑμῖν with ἐσταυρ., and explain either as *propter vos* (Koppe), contrary to the use of ἐν with *persons* (see on i. 24) ; or, unsuitably to the figurative idea κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς κ.τ.λ., *in animis vestris*, "your minds ;"[1] or (as usually) *inter vos*, "among you :" "so clearly, so evidently . . . just as if crucified among you," Rückert. But the latter must have been expressed by ὡς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσταυρ., and would also presuppose that the apostle's preaching of the cross had embodied a vivid and detailed *description* of the crucifixion It was not this, however, but the *fact itself* (as the ἱλαστήριον), which formed the sum and substance of the preaching of the cross ; as is certain from the apostle's letters. Lastly, Luther's peculiar interpretation, justly rejected by Calovius, but nevertheless again adopted in substance by Matthias,—that ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσταυρ. is a severe *censure*, "*quod Christus*, 'that Christ' (namely, after the rejection of grace) *non vivit, sed mortuus in eis est*, 'does not live, but has died in them' (Heb. vi. 6)," which Paul had laid before them *argumentis praedictis*, "in the arguments before mentioned"—is as far-fetched, as alien from the usual Pauline mode of expression, and as unsuitable to the context as the view of Cajetanus, that, according to the idea "Christ suffers in His members" (Col. i. 24), ἐν ὑμ. ἐσταυρ. is equivalent to *for the sake of whom ye have suffered so much.* — ἐσταυρ.] *as the Crucified One*, is with great emphasis moved on to the end.[2]

---

[1] Comp. Ptol. viii. 25. 15, and see Hermann on our passage.

[2] So taken correctly also by Matthias, who, however, explains the expression from the idea of an *amulet* used against the *enchantment*. But this idea would presuppose some *secret writing*, the very opposite of which is conveyed by the expression.

[3] Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 2 f.

[4] Comp. iv. 19.

[5] An objection urged by Reiche.

[6] Also Hermann, Bretschneider, and Rettig, *l.c.* p. 98 ff.

[7] Rettig, however, remarking undecidedly, that it may also mean *palam scribere*, "to write openly."

[8] Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 2; Soph. *Phil.* 1309 : γράφου φρενῶν ἔσω ; Aesch. *Prom.* 791, *Suppl.* 991, *Choeph.* 450.

[9] Winer, comp. Schott.

[10] Reiche, "id factum esse a se, gentium apostolo, *inter eos praesente*," "that it was done by himself, the apostle of the Gentiles, while present with them" (not, it might be, *alio loco* or *per homines sublestae fidei*, not *clanculum*, but *cunctis*, *publico*

Ver. 2. The *foolishness* of their error is now disclosed to them, by reminding them of their reception of the Holy Spirit. "See how effectually he treats the topic from experience," Luther, 1519. — τοῦτο μόνον θέλω μαθεῖν ἀφ'

---

eorum conventu, etc., "in another place," or, "by men of trifling faith," not "secretly," but "before all, in their public assembly," etc. Wieseler : "not merely *from a distance* by means of an *epistle*."

[1] To this category belongs Bengel's mystical interpretation, "*forma crucis* ejus in corde vestro per fidem expressa, ut jam vos etiam cum illo crucefigeremini," "the form of his cross is by faith impressed upon your heart, that now you might also be crucified with Him." Thus the expression would signify the killing of the old man which had taken place through ethical fellowship in the death of Christ, to which ἐν ὑμ. ἐσταυρ. is referred by Storr also. A similar view is taken by Jatho, *Br. an d. Gal.* p. 24 : that ἐν ὑμῖν is proleptic, "so that He, as the atoning One, came into and abode in you ;" comp. Ewald, "to paint clearly before the eyes that Christ is now really crucified in them, and, since they have Him in them, He has not been crucified for them in vain ;" also Windischmann.

[2] Comp. 1 Cor. ii. 2, i. 23.

ὑμῶν] *This only*—not to speak of other self-confessions, which I might demand of you for your refutation—*this only I wish to become aware of from you.* Bengel pertinently remarks: "μόνον, grave argumentum." To take μαθεῖν (with Luther, Bengel, Paulus) in the narrower sense *to learn*—the apostle thus representing himself ironically as a *scholar*—is justified neither by the tone of the context nor by the tenor of the question, which in fact concerns not a doctrine, but simply a *piece of information;* μανθάνω is well known in the sense of *to come to know*, *cognoscere.*[1] τοῦτο βούλομαι μαθεῖν. — ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν] is not used instead of παρ᾽ ὑμῶν (Rückert); for ἀπό also may denote a *direct* μαθεῖν.[2] And *this* is what Paul means, for he conceives himself speaking with his readers as if they were present. — ἐξ ἔργων νόμου κ.τ.λ.] Was it your fulfilment of works which the law prescribes,[3] or was it the preaching to you of *faith* (that is, faith in Christ), which caused your reception of the Spirit? The πνεῦμα is the *Holy* Spirit (the personal divine principle of the whole Christian nature and life), and the Holy Spirit viewed generally according to His very various modes of operation, by which He makes Himself known in different individuals; not merely in relation to the *miraculous gifts*, 1 Cor. xii.–xiv.;[4] for Paul reminds the *whole body* of his readers of their reception of the Spirit, and it is not till ver. 5 that the δυνάμεις are specially brought forward as a *specific form* of the operations of the Spirit.[5]—The ἤ which follows means: *or*, *on the other hand;* "duo directe opposita," Bengel. The ἀκοὴ πίστεως is explained either as the *hearing of faith*,[6] or as *that which is heard*, *i.e.*, *the report*, *the message of faith*, which treats of faith. ἀκοή admits of either meaning.[7] But πίστεως is decisive in favor of the latter, for it is never the "*doctrina* fidei," "doctrine of faith" (see on i. 23), but always the subjective *faith*, which, however, as here, may be regarded objectively; and hence also adherents of the second interpretation,[8] are wrong in taking πίστις as *system of doctrine.* Moreover, ἀκοή, in the sense of *preaching* (discourse heard), but *not* in the sense of *auditio*, "hearing," is familiar in the N. T.;[9] hence Holsten incorrectly takes πίστεως as the genitive of the subject to ἀκοῆς, so that the πίστις is the ἀκούουσα,—a view opposed also by Rom. x. 17. But Hofmann also is incorrect in holding that it should be construed ἐκ πίστεως ἀκοῆς (faith in news announced); against which the antithesis ἐξ ἔργων νόμου is decisive. Through the news concerning faith, which was preached to them, the readers had become believers (Rom. x. 17; Heb. iv. 2), and consequently partakers of the Holy Spirit. Lastly, Flatt and

---

[1] See Acts xxiii. 27; Ex. ii. 4; 2 Macc. vii. 2; 3 Macc. i. 1; Xen. *Cyr.* vi. 1. 31; *Hell.* ii. 1. 1; Aesch. *Agam.* 615. Comp. Soph. *Oed. Col.* 505.

[2] Comp. especially Col. i. 7; see on 1 Cor. xi. 23.

[3] Comp. on ii. 16.

[4] Chrysostom, Theophylact, Jerome.

[5] Comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 27 f.

[6] Reception of the gospel preached: Vulgate, Beza, Bengel, Morus, Rückert, Usteri, Schott, Matthias, Reithmayr, and others.

[7] For the former, comp. Plat. *Theaet.* p. 142 D; Plut. *Mor.* p. 41 E; Soph. *El.* 30; LXX. 1 Sam. xv. 22: and for the latter, comp. Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 274 C; Dem. 1097. 3; LXX. Isa. liii. 1; John xii.38; 1 Thess. ii. 13; Rom. x. 17; Heb. iv. 2; Ecclus. xli. 23.

[8] As Calvin, Grotius, Zachariae, Rosenmüller, and others.

[9] So even in Rom. x. 16, John xii. 38, passages which Matthias seeks to explain differently.

Matthies, following a few ancient expositors, have quite arbitrarily and, although not without linguistic precedent in the LXX. (1 Sam. xv. 22), without any countenance from the N. T., understood ἀκοῆς as equivalent to ὑπακοῆς (Rom. i. 5, xvi. 26 ; 1 Pet. i. 22). The *acceptance* of the ἀκοὴ πίστεως which took place on the part of the readers was understood by them as a matter of course, since from this ἀκοή proceeded the reception of the Spirit. They were in fact *called* through the gospel.

Ver. 3. *Are ye to such a degree irrational?*—pointing to *what follows.* The *interrogative* view (in opposition to Hofmann) is in keeping with the fervor of the language, and is logically justified by the indication of the *high degree* implied in οὕτως.[1] — ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι, νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε ;] *After ye have begun by means of the Spirit, are ye now brought to completion by means of the flesh?* The second part of the sentence is *ironical:* "After ye have made a beginning in the Christian life by your receiving the Holy Spirit (ver. 2), are ye now to be made perfect by your becoming persons whose life is subject to the government of the σάρξ ? Do ye lend yourselves to *such* completion as this ?" In the same measure in which the readers went back to the legal standpoint and departed from the life of faith, must they again be emptied of the Holy Spirit which they had received, and consequently be reconverted from πνευματικοί into σαρκικοί (Rom. vii. 5, 14), that is, men who, loosed from the influence of the Holy Spirit, are again under the dominion of the σάρξ which impels to sin (Rom. vii. 14 ff., viii. 7 f., *et al.*). For the law cannot overcome the σάρξ (Rom. viii. 3, 4 ; 1 Cor. xv. 56). According to this view, therefore, πνεῦμα and σάρξ[2] designate, not Christianity and Judaism *themselves*, but the *specific agencies of life* in Christianity and Judaism (Rom. vii. 5, 6), expressed, indeed, without the article in *qualitative contrast* as *Spirit* and *flesh*, but in the obvious concrete application meaning nothing else than the Holy Spirit and the unspiritual, corporeal and psychical nature of man, which draws him into opposition to God and inclination to sin (see, *e.g.*, Rom. iv. 1; John iii. 6). — ἐναρξάμενοι] *What it is which* they have begun, is obvious from πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε in ver. 2, namely, the state into which they entered through the reception of the Spirit—the Christian life.[3] This reception is "the indisputable sign of the existence and working of true Christianity," Ewald. — ἐπιτελεῖσθε] is understood by most modern expositors[4] as *middle* ;[5] although Koppe (with whom Rückert agrees) entirely obliterates the literal sense by the assumption, that it is put so only for the sake of the contrast and denotes "*tantum id, quod nunc inter Gal. fieri solebat, contrarium pristinae eorum sapientiae*," "only that which was now generally occurring among the Galatians contrary to their former wisdom," etc. Winer explains more definitely: "carne finire, h. e. ita ad τὴν σάρκα se applicare, ut in his studiis σαρκικοῖς plane acquiescas," "to finish in the flesh, *i.e.*, so to apply oneself to the flesh as to entirely acquiesce in these fleshly pursuits;" and Wieseler: "instead of your advancing onward to the goal, ye make the most shameful retrogression."[1] But ἐπιτελεῖν and ἐπιτελεῖσθαι always denote *ending* in the sense of *completion*, of accomplishing and bringing fully to a conclusion (*consummare*).[2] If, therefore, the word is taken as *middle*, it must be explained: "*After ye have begun* (your Christian life) *with the Spirit, do ye now bring* (that which ye have begun) *to completion with the flesh?*"[3] But the active *to complete* is always in the N. T. represented by ἐπιτελεῖν, not by ἐπιτελεῖσθαι in the middle (comp., on the contrary, 1 Pet. v. 9), however undoubted is the occurrence of the medial use among Greek authors.[4] Moreover, the τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῇ which follows (see on ver. 4) makes the subject of ἐπιτελεῖσθε appear as *suffering*, and thereby indicates the word to be *passive*, as, following the Vulgate (*consummamini*), Chrysostom, and Theophylact, many of the older expositors have understood it,[5]—viz., so that the Judaistic operations, which the readers had experience of and allowed to be practised on themselves, are expressed by antiphrasis, and doubtless in reference to their own opinion and that of their teachers, as *their Christian completion* (τέλειοι ποιεῖσθε!).[6] But how cutting and putting to shame this irony is, is felt at once from the contradictory juxtaposition of *carne perficimini*, "ye are made perfect in the flesh!" Nearest to our view (without, however, bringing forward the *ironical* character of the words) comes that of Beza, who says that *perficimini* applies to the teaching of the pseudo-apostles, who ascribed "*Christo tantum initia, legi perfectionem justitiae*," "to Christ only the beginning, and to the law the perfection of righteousness."[7] The *present* denotes that the Galatians were *just* occupied in this ἐπιτελεῖσθαι. Comp. i. 6. The emphatic νῦν ("*nunc*, cum magis magisque deberetis spirituales fieri relicta carne," "now, when the flesh being left, ye should have become more and more spiritual," Bengel) should have prevented it from being taken as the *Attic future* (Studer, Usteri).

---

[1] On οὕτως, comp. Soph. *Ant.* 220, οὐκ ἔστιν οὕτω μῶρος, "is not *so* foolish :" John iii. 16; Gal. i. 6; Heb. xii. 21; and see Voigtländer, *ad Luc. D. M.* p. 220; Jacob, *ad Luc. Alex.* p. 28.

[2] Following Chrysostom, Theophylact, and many ancient expositors. Rückert, Usteri, and Schott believe that σαρκί is chosen with special reference to *circumcision* (Eph. ii. 11). But the context by no means treats specially of circumcision, and the contrast of itself necessarily involved σαρκί.

[3] Bos, Wolf, and others, as also Schott, assume the figurative idea of a *race in the stadium.* But this reference would require to be suggested by the *context* (as in v. 7); for although ἐπιτελεῖσθαι is used of the completion of a race, as of every kind of completion (Herodian. viii. 8. 5, iii. 8. 17 f., iv. 2. 7), it has not this special meaning of itself, but acquires it from the context.

[4] Including Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann.

[5] Comp. Luther, Castalio, and others.

Ver. 4. After Paul, by the νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε, has reminded his readers of all that they had most foolishly submitted to at the hands of the false apostles, in order to be made, according to their own and their teachers' fancy, finished Christians, he now discloses to them the uselessness of it in the *exclamation* (not *interrogation*), "*So much have ye suffered without profit!*" What he means by τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε, is therefore everything with which the false apostles in their Judaistic zeal had molested and burdened the Galatians,—the many exactions, in name of compliance with the law, which these had necessarily to undergo at the hands of their new teachers.[1] Bengel refers it to the patient endurance of the apostle's ministry, produced through the Holy Spirit; but this view is not at all suggested by the context, and would not correspond to the sense of πάσχειν (but rather of ἀνέχεσθαι). All the expositors before Schomer (in Wolf) and Homberg,[2] understand it (following Chrysostom and Augustine) of *the sufferings and persecutions on account of Christianity;* so that Paul asks, "Have ye suffered so much in vain? Seeing, namely, that ye have fallen away from the faith and hence cannot attain to the glory which tribulation brings in its train" (2 Cor. iv. 17; Rom. viii. 17). But, apart from the fact that no extraordinary sufferings on the part of the Galatians are either touched upon in the epistle (iv. 29 is quite general in its character) or known to us otherwise, this interpretation is completely foreign to the connection. After Schomer and Homberg, others[3] explain it: "*So many benefits* (by means of the Spirit) *have ye experienced in vain?*"[4] Certainly πάσχω, *something befalls me*, is a *vox media*, "colorless word" (hence Matthies even wishes to understand it of the agreeable and disagreeable *together*), which, according to the well-known Greek usage, as the passive side of the idea of ποιεῖν, may be employed also of *happy* experiences;[5] but, as the latter use of the word always occurs with a qualitative addition either expressed (εὖ, χάριν, τερπνόν, ἀγαθά, ὀνήσιμα, or the like) or indicated beyond doubt by the immediate context,[6] it is not to be found at all in the whole of the New Test., the LXX., or the Apocrypha (not even Esth. ix. 29). Thus the interpretation, even if τοσαῦτα could convey any such qualitative definition of the text, is without precedent in the usage of Scripture. Paul in particular, often as he speaks about the experiences of divine grace, never uses for this purpose πάσχειν, which with him always denotes the experience *of suffering*. He would have written, as the correlative of the bestowal of grace, ἐλάβετε or ἐδέξασθε (2 Cor. vi. 1). Ewald's suggestion of *powerful and vehement* movements of the Spirit is forced, and unwarranted by the text. The very word τοσαῦτα points to the suffering of *evil*, just as πολλά, μάλα πολλὰ παθεῖν, without κακά or the like, is frequently so used in Greek authors. — εἴγε καὶ εἰκῇ] A hint that the case might be *still worse* than was expressed in εἰκῇ: *if indeed it is only in vain* (and not even to the positive jeopardy of your Messianic salvation) that ye have suffered.[7] Chrysostom and his followers discover a *mitigation* and *encouragement to improvement* in the words εἰ γὰρ βουληθείητέ φησιν ἀνανῆψαι καὶ ἀνακτήσασθαι ἑαυτοὺς, οὐκ εἰκῇ, "if you would be willing to be recovered and restored, it would not be in vain," Chrysostom, as also Ambrose, Luther,[1] Erasmus, Calvin, Clarius, Zeger, Calovius, Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Zachariae, Morus, and others. In this case καί must be understood as *really*;[2] but the idea of *improvement*, whereby the supposed case of the εἰκῇ would be cancelled, is not indicated by aught in the context. Even should the words be taken as merely leaving open the *possibility*, *that matters had not actually already gone so far with the readers* (Hofmann), Paul himself would have rendered his very earnest reproach τοσαῦτα ἐπάθ. εἰκῇ both problematical and ambiguous, and would thus have taken the whole pith out of it.—εἴγε] *assuming*, *namely*, that ye even only, etc., makes the condition more prominent, and serves to intensify the mere εἰ. Paul fears that *more* may take place than that which was only expressed by εἰκῇ. This, however, is conveyed by the context, and is independent of the γέ, instead of which πέρ might have been used.[3] Still more marked prominence would have been given to the condition by εἴπερ γε καί.[4] [See Note XLIII., p. 159.]

---

[1] Comp. Hofmann.

[2] See especially Phil. i. 6, ὁ ἐναρξάμενος . . . ἐπιτελέσει; 1 Sam. iii. 12, ἄρξομαι καὶ ἐπιτελέσω: Zech. iv. 9; Luke xiii. 32; Rom. xv. 28; 2 Cor. vii. 1, viii. 6, 11; Heb. viii. 5, ix. 6. Comp. Thucyd. iv. 90. 4, ὅσα ἦν ὑπόλοιπα ἐπιτελέσαι: Xen. *Anab.* iv. 3. 13.

[3] Comp. Holsten.

[4] Plat. *Phil.* p. 27 C; Xen. *Mem.* iv. 8. 8; Polyb. i. 40. 16, ii. 58. 10, v. 108. 9.

[5] Some of them indeed translating it passively, but in the interpretation (comp. Erasmus, Calvin, and others, also Bengel) not strictly maintaining the passive sense.

[6] Comp. also Matthias, Vömel, Reithmayr.

[7] Comp. Semler.

---

[1] Comp. i. 6 f., iv. 10, v. 2, 8, vi. 12, ii. 4; 2 Cor. xi. 20.

[2] As also Grotius, Calovius, Wolf, Semler, Michaelis, Morus, Rückert, Olshausen, Reithmayr, and others.

[3] Including Schoettgen, Raphel, Kypke, Zachariae, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Borger, Flatt, Winer, Usteri, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann, Matthias, Sieffert.

[4] So also Fritzsche, *Diss.* I. *in* 2 Cor. p. 54, and Holsten.

[5] Xen. *Anab.* v. 5. 9: ἀγαθὸν μέν τι πάσχειν, κακὸν δὲ μηδέν.

[6] As Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 15. 1: ὅσα παθόντες ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ πηλίκων εὐεργεσιῶν μεταλαβόντες.

[7] On καί, compare Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 136; Baeuml. *Partik.* p. 150. So, in substance, Beza, Grotius, Wolf, Semler, Kypke, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Paulus, Matthies, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler, Matthias, and others.

Ver. 5. After the logical parenthesis (vv. 3, 4), οὖν resumes[5] what was said in ver. 2, but in an altered tense (the *present*), in order to annex the example of Abraham as a proof of justification by faith. — ἐπιχορηγῶν and ἐνεργῶν are not to be understood as *imperfect* participles;[6] for, if referring to the reception of the Spirit *for the first time* corresponding to ἐλάβετε in ver. 2, Paul must have written ἐπιχορηγήσας and ἐνεργήσας. No, he denotes the ἐπιχορηγεῖν κ.τ.λ. as *still continuing* among the Galatians; it has not yet ceased, although now, of course, in consequence of the active efforts of the Judaizers under which they had suffered, it could not but be less strong and general than previously;[7] "nondum ceciderant, sed inclinabantur, ut caderent," "they had not yet fallen, but were inclining towards a fall," Augustine. — In ἐπιχορηγεῖν the ἐπί is not *insuper*, "besides," but denotes the *direction*, as in the German "*dar*reichen, *zu*kommen lassen."[8] — καὶ ἐνεργ.] *and* — to make mention of a particular χάρισμα — *which*, etc. — δυνάμεις] may be *miracles* (1 Cor. xii. 10);[9] or *miraculous powers* (1 Cor. xii. 28).[10] The analogy of 1 Cor. xii. 6 (comp. Phil. ii. 13; Eph. ii. 2) favors the latter. — ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστ.] *sc.* ποιεῖ τοῦτο,[11] or ἐπιχορηγεῖ ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα κ. ἐνεργεῖ δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν; Is this his operation upon you caused by works of the law or by the knowledge of faith? comes it in consequence of your prosecuting those works, or of such knowledge being communicated to you? by the former way of active merit, or by the latter way of the reception of divine preaching? As to ἀκοὴ πίστεως, here also not (with Hofmann) = πίστις ἀκοῆς, see on ver. 2.

---

[1] "Objurgat quidem, sed ita ut semper oleum juxta infundat, ne eos ad desperationem adigat. . . . Non omnino abjeci spem de vobis," "He chides indeed, but in such way as always to pour in oil at the same time, in order not to drive them to despair . . . I have not entirely cast away my hope of you."

[2] Hartung, I. p. 132.

[3] See Baeuml. *l.c.* p. 64 f. Comp. on 2 Cor. v. 3; Eph. iii. 2.

[4] Plat. *Theaet.* p. 187 D; Herod. vi. 16.

[5] Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 22 f.; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 719.

[6] Castalio, Bengel, Semler, and others.

[7] νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε, ver. 3.

[8] 2 Cor. ix. 10; Col. ii. 19; 2 Pet. i. 5; comp. also Phil. i. 19.

[9] In which case ἐν is *among*, Winer and others.

[10] In which case ἐν is *within* you, Borger, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, Wieseler, and others.

[11] Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 336.

Ver. 6. The answer, obvious of itself, to the preceding question is: ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; and to this, but not directly to that question itself,[1] Paul subjoins—making use of the words well known to his readers, Gen. xv. 6, according to the LXX.—that great religious-historic argument for the righteousness of faith, which is presented in the justification of the progenitor of the theocratic people. Seeing that Paul has just specified the operation of the Spirit caused by the preached news of faith, as *that which proves the justifying power of faith*, he may with just logic continue: *even as Abraham believed God* (trusted His Messianic promise; comp. on John viii. 56), *and it* (this faith) *was counted to him as righteousness*, that is, in the judgment of the gracious God was imputed to him as rectitude.[2] [See Note XLIV., p. 159 seq.] Neither, therefore, is a colon to be placed[3] after Ἀβρ., nor[4] is ver. 6 to be considered as protasis and ver. 7 as apodosis, for ver. 7 is evidently independent, and it would be a very arbitrary course[5] to take ver. 6 as an anacoluthon.[6] For the reward of Abraham's justifying faith according to Gen. *l.c.*, see Jas. ii. 22 f.; 1 Macc. ii. 52; and Mechilta.[7]

Ver. 7. *Know ye therefore* (since Abraham's *faith* was counted to him for righteousness) *that those who are of faith*, etc. — γινώσκετε is taken as *indicative* by Cyprian, *ep.* 63 *ad Caecil.*, Jerome, Ambrose, Luther, Erasmus, Beza, Menochius, Piscator, Semler, Rosenmüller, Rückert, Reithmayr, and others. The tone of the passage is more animated by taking it as *imperative*.[8] — οἱ ἐκ πίστ.] designates believers, according to this their specific peculiarity, under the point of view *of origin*. It is *faith* from which their spiritual state of life proceeds.[9] — οὗτοι] has the emphasis:[10] *these*, and no others. The contrast here is usually supposed to be: *not the bodily descendants of Abraham*. But how foreign to the context is a comparison between the bodily and spiritual children of Abraham! The only interpretation in harmony with the context is: "*these, and not those who are* ἐξ ἔργων νόμου."[11] So also, correctly, Rückert and Wieseler. — υἱοὶ Ἀβρ.] *children of Abraham* in the true sense. For the true υἱοί can have no nature different from the essential nature of the father.

---

[1] As Hofmann holds, according to his wrong interpretation of ἀκοῆς πίστεως.

[2] It is self-evident from the words of the text, how improperly the idea of sanctification is here mixed up with justification by the Catholics (also Bisping and Reithmayr). We have here justification simply as an *actus forensis*, a forensic act of the divine judgment, and that proceeding from grace, Rom. iv. 2 ff.

[3] With Koppe.

[4] With Beza and Hilgenfeld.

[5] With Hilgenfeld.

[6] See, moreover, on Rom. iv. 3; Hoelemann, *de justitiæ ex fide ambabus in V. T. sedibus*, Lips. 1867, p. 8 ff.

[7] *Jalkut. Sim.* I. f. 69. 3, "hoc planum est, Abrahamum neque hunc mundum neque futurum haereditate consequi potuisse, nisi per fidem, qua credidit," It is plain that Abraham could have obtained by inheritance neither this world *nor* the future, unless through the faith by which he believed," q. d. Gen. xv. 6.

[8] The Vulgate has in Lachmann's text, *cognoscite*. So also Castalio, Calvin, and others, as well as most modern expositors.

[9] Comp. Rom. ii. 8, iii. 26, iv. 14; John xviii. 37, *et al.*

[10] Comp. Rom. viii. 14, ix. 6.

[11] See vv. 8-10.

[12] Comp. John viii. 8, 39; Rom. iv. 11 f.

Vv. 8, 9. After having pointed out from the Scripture that none other than believers are *sons* of Abraham, Paul now shows further according to Scripture that none other than these have a share in Abraham's *blessing*, that is, *are justified.*

Ver. 8. Δέ] marks the transition from the *sonship* of Abraham pertaining to believers to the *participation in his blessing.* — προϊδοῦσα] personification.[1] The *Scripture* foresaw and the *Scripture* announced beforehand, inasmuch as whatever *God* foresaw and announced beforehand—in reference, namely, to that which is at present taking place—formed an element of Scripture, and was expreseed in it.[2] — ἐκ πίστεως] is the main point of the participial sentence : *of faith*, not of the works of the law as the causal condition on the side of man. — δικαιοῖ] *present*, for the time foreseen (προϊδοῦσα) was the Christian present. — τὰ ἔθνη] *the Gentiles* (comp. ver. 14), so that the latter have not to subject themselves to the law in order to become righteous. — προευηγγελίσατο] *pre-announced the glad tidings.* προ refers, as in προϊδοῦσα, to the future realization in Christian times. This promise was a gospel *before* the gospel. The word does not occur elsewhere in the New Test., in the LXX., or the Apocrypha ; but it is found in Philo.[3] — ὅτι ἐνευλογηϑήσ. ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔϑνη] Gen. xii. 3, quoted according to the LXX. with the recitative ὅτι, but so that, instead of πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, πάντα τὰ ἔϑνη is adopted from Gen. xviii. 18;[4] and this not accidentally, but because Paul is dealing with *Gentile* Christians, whom it was desired to subject to the law. Hence[5] it is not to be explained[6] of all *nations*, both Jews and Gentiles.—The *emphasis* in this utterance of promise is to be laid, not on πάντα (Schott), but on the prefixed ἐνευλογηϑήσονται. For if the Scripture had not foreseen that *faith* would justify the Gentiles, it would not have promised *blessing* in Abraham to all the Gentiles ; from which it follows (ver. 10) that it is *believers* who receive this blessing, and not those of the law, on whom indeed the Scripture pronounces not blessing, but *curse* (ver. 10). The characteristic ἐνευλογ. can only be meant to apply to those who are of faith, and not to those who are of the law. *What* it is that in Paul's view is expressed by ἐνευλογεῖσϑαι, Gen. xii. 3, in its Messianic fulfilment, is evident from the preceding ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοῖ τὰ ἔϑνη, namely, God's gracious gift of *justification* (the opposite of the κατάρα, vv. 10, 11), which, because it is promised as *blessing*, can only be shared by *believers*, and not by those of the law who are under *curse.*[7] The correctness of this view is certainly confirmed by ver. 14, where to the reception of the blessing there is annexed, as a *further* reception, that of the Holy Spirit, so that the bestowal of the Spirit is not included in the idea of the *εὐλογία*, but this idea is limited in conformity with the context to the justification, with which the whole reception of salvation begins. [See Note XLV., p. 160.] — *ἐν σοί* is not : *per tuam posteritatem, i.e., Christum,* "through your posterity, *i.e.*, Christ,"[1] by which interpretation the personal *σοί* (and how much at variance with ver. 9 !) is entirely set aside, as if *ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου* (ver. 16) were used. But it is : *in thee ;* that is, in the fact that *thou* art blessed (art justified) is involved (as a consequence) the blessedness of all the Gentiles, in so far as all the Gentiles are to attain justification by faith, and it is in the blessing of Abraham, the father of all the faithful (Rom. iv.), that the connection between faith and justification is opened and instituted for all future time. Comp. Ellicott. On *ἐνευλογεῖσθαι*, *to be blessed in the person of any one*, a word which does not occur in Greek authors, comp. Acts iii. 25, Ecclus. xliv. 21.

---

[1] Comp. ver. 22; Rom. iv. 3, ix. 17; John vii. 38.

[2] Comp. the frequent λέγει ἡ γραφή ; likewise *Siphra*, f. 186. 2: *Quid vidit* (ראה) *scriptura*, etc., "what did scripture see."

[3] *De opif. m.* p. 7 A, *de nom. mut.* p. 1069 D; also *Schol. Soph. Trach.* 335.

[4] Comp. also xxii. 18.

[5] And see ver. 14.

[6] With Winer, Matthias, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, following earlier expositors

[7] De Wette, who is followed by Wieseler, understands the *blessing* to be "*the whole salvation of the kingdom of God*,"—an idea too comprehensive for the context. Bähr (in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, p. 920) erroneously concludes from ver. 14, that by the blessing is meant the *reception of the Spirit.* See on ver. 14. This reception, as well as the Messianic salvation generally,—or, "*the good which is intended for mankind*," as Hofmann puts it,—ensues as a *consequence* of the εὐλογία, as the Messianic ἀπώλεια ensues as a *consequence* of the κατάρα, if the latter, as in the case of those who adhere to the works

Ver. 9. *Ὥστε*] The general *result from* vv. 7, 8. If, namely, *believers* are sons of Abraham (ver. 7), and if the Scripture, in its promise of blessing to Abraham, has had in view *faith* as the source of divine justification for the Gentiles, *believers accordingly are those who are blessed with believing Abraham. ὥστε* is used in its common acceptation of the *actual consequence*, and is therefore not to be explained in the sense of *οὕτως νῦν*, to which Hofmann's view comes. — *οἱ ἐκ πίστεως*] has the whole emphasis, as in ver. 7. — *σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβρ.*] Paul does not repeat *ἐν*, but writes *σύν*, because he looks from the present time of *εὐλογοῦνται* into the past, in which Abraham stands forth as the blessed one, *with* whom those who become blessed are now placed on a like footing. *σύν* is not, however, equivalent to *καθώς*, a view on behalf of which appeal ought not to be made to Rom. viii. 32 ;[2] but it expresses *fellowship*, for believers, inasmuch as they are blessed (justified), share with believing Abraham the same divine benefit which began in his person and is extended to believers as the *υἱούς* homogeneous with him. The predicate *πιστῷ* is added to *Ἀβρ.*, in order to denote the similarity of the ethical character, which necessarily accompanies the similarity of the result.

Ver. 10. *Argumentum e contrario*, "argument from the contrary," for the correctness of the result exhibited in ver. 9.[3] For how entirely different is the

---

of the law, is not cancelled (ver. 10). The *εὐλογία*, therefore, is not yet the blessing of Messianic salvation itself, the *κληρονομία*, but, as Hunnius (in Calovius) aptly explains it, "Benedici in hac promissione est *liberari maledictione* legis aeternae et vicissim *haeredem scribi* justitiae et bonorum coelestium," "To be blessed, in this promise, is to be freed from the curse of the eternal law, and in turn to be enrolled an heir of righteousness and heavenly blessings." Grotius is much too indefinite : "Summa bona adipiscentur," "They will attain the highest blessings." Also Ewald's paraphrase, "the blessing of the true religion," is too general. Beza, Usteri, Rückert, take the right view ; comp. also Möller (on de Wette) and Reithmayr.

[1] Jerome, Oecumenius, Menochius, Estius, Calovius, Rambach, Morus, Borger, Flatt, Schott ; comp. also Bengel.

[2] Koppe and others.

[3] The conclusion is based upon the dilemma : *either* from faith *or* from the law. *Tertium non datur*, "there is no third alternative." This is no supposititious idea (as Hofmann objects), but a necessary logical assumption, such as exists in every argument *e contrario.*

position of those who are *workers of the law!* These, as a whole, according to the Scripture, are under *a curse;* so that it cannot be supposed that they should *become blessed.* The extension of the argumentative force of the γάρ to the whole series of propositions, vv. 10–14,[1] so that ver. 10 would only form the introduction to the argument, is the less to be approved, because this γάρ is followed by a second and subordinate γάρ, and then in ver. 11 an argument entirely complete in itself is introduced by δέ. Moreover, by the quotation of Scripture in ver. 10 that which it is intended to prove (ὅσοι κ.τ.λ.) is proved completely and strikingly.[2] — ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσίν] the opposite of the οἱ ἐκ πίστεως in ver. 7: *for all who are of works of the law*, that is, those whose characteristic moral condition is produced and regulated by observance of the law (comp. on Rom. ii. 8), the men of law, οἱ ἐχόμενοι τοῦ νόμου, Oecumenius.[3] — The quotation is from Deut. xxvii. 26 freely after the LXX.; and the *probative* force of the passage in reference to ὅσοι . . . ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσί turns on the fact that no one is adequate, either quantitatively or qualitatively, to the ἐμμένειν ἐν πᾶσι κ.τ.λ.; consequently all who are ἐξ ἔργων νόμου are subjected to the curse here ordained. He alone would not be so, who should really render the *complete* (ἐν πᾶσι) and *constant* (ἐμμένει) obedience to the law, by virtue of which he as a doer of the law would necessarily be pronounced righteous (Rom. ii. 13), and would have a claim to salvation as ὀφείλημα (Rom. iv. 4); but see Rom. iii. 9–20, vii. 7–25. — ἐπικατάρατος] *sc.* ἐστι, אָרוּר, κατηράμενος, Matt. xxv. 41, that is, has incurred the divine ὀργή.[4] The word does not occur in Greek authors, among whom κατάρατος is frequently used. But comp. Wisd. iii. 13, xiv. 8; Tob. xiii. 12; 4 Macc. ii. 19. The ἀπώλεια, eternal death, the opposite of the ζήσεται in ver. 11, ensues as the final destiny of the ἐπικατάρατος (comp. Matt. xxv. 41), the consummation and effect of the κατάρα. — ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει] What is written in the book of the law is conceived as the normal range of action, which man *steps beyond.*[5] More frequently used by classical authors with the mere dative than with ἐν. — πᾶσι] as well as the previous πᾶς, is found in the Samaritan text and in the LXX., but not in the Hebrew. Jerome, however, groundlessly accuses the Jews of mutilating the text on purpose (to mitigate the severity of the expression). — τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά] design of the ἐμμένει κ.τ.λ.

Ver. 11 f. Δέ] carrying on the argument. After Paul in ver. 10 has proved the participation of *believers* in the blessing of Abraham by the *argumentum e contrario*, that *those who are of the law* are under *curse*, it is his object now—in order to complete the doctrinal explanation begun in ver. 6 on the basis of Scripture—to show, on the same basis, the only way of justification, and that (*a*) *negatively:* it is not by the way of the *law* that man becomes righteous (vv. 11, 12), and (*b*) *positively: Christ* has made us free from the curse of the law (ver. 13). Observe (in opposition to Wieseler's objection) that in

---

[1] Holsten, Hofmann.

[2] In opposition to Holsten, *z. Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 290.

[3] Comp. ὁ ἐργαζόμενος, Rom. iv. 4.

[4] Comp. Rom. iv. 15.

[5] Comp. Acts xiv. 22; Heb. viii. 9; 2 Tim. iii. 14; Xen. *Ages.* 1. 11; Thuc. iv. 118. 9; Plat. *Legg.* viii. p. 844 C; Polyb. iii. 70. 4; Isocr. *de Pace*, p. 428 *fin.;* Liban. IV. 271, Reiske; Joseph. *Antt.* viii. 10. 3, *et al.*

δικαιοῦται παρὰ τ. Θεῷ, the being justified *in spite of the curse*, and consequently the becoming free from it, is clearly and necessarily implied by the context preceding (ver. 10) and following (ver. 13). — Vv. 11 and 12 contain a complete *syllogism ;* *ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστ. ζήσεται* forming the major proposition, ver. 12 the minor, and *ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ* the conclusion. The subtle objections of Hofmann are refuted not only by the combination *ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως*, but also by the necessary inner correlation of *δικαιοσύνη* and *ζωή*, which are put as reciprocal.— The first *ὅτι* is declarative, and the second causal : "but *that* through the law no one . . . , is evident, *because*," etc. Homberg and Flatt take them conversely : "But *because* through the law no one . . . , it is evident *that*," etc. The circumstance that *δῆλον ὅτι* must mean *it is evident*, *that* (Flatt),[1] is not to be adduced as *favoring the latter* view ; for in our interpretation also it has this meaning, only *ὅτι* is made to precede.[2] *Against* it, on the other hand, we may urge, that ver. 12 would be quite superfluous and irrelevant to the argument, and also that *ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται*, as a well-known *aphorism of Scripture*, is far more fitly employed to prove than to be itself proved. Far better is the view of Bengel, who likewise is not inclined to separate *δῆλον ὅτι* : "Quod attinet ad id 'as to the fact' (the former *ὅτι* thus being equivalent to *εἰς ἐκεῖνο, ὅτι*, 2 Cor. i. 18, xi. 10 ; John ii. 18, ix. 17), quod in lege nemo justificetur coram Deo, id sane certum est," "that no one is justified in the law before God, it is doubtless true," etc. The usual view is, however, more natural[3] and more emphatic. Hofmann[4] wishes to take vv. 11, 12 as protasis to vv. 13, 14 ; according to his view, *ὅτι* specifies the cause, and *δῆλον* (or *δηλονότι*) only introduces the illustration of this cause. But we thus get a long parenthetically involved period, differing from the whole context, in which Paul expresses himself only in short sentences without periodic complication ; moreover, the well-known use of *δηλονότι* as *namely*[5] does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., although the opportunities for its use were very frequent (1 Cor. xv. 27, 1 Tim. vi. 7, are wrongly adduced) ; further, it is *à priori* very improbable that the two important quotations in vv. 11, 12 should be destined merely for incidental illustration ;[6] and lastly, there would result an awkward thought, as if, namely, Christ had been moved to His work of redemption, in the death on the cross, by the *reflection* contained in vv. 11, 12.[7] —*ἐν νόμῳ*] not : *by observance of the law*, which would be *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου*,[8] but : *through the law*, in so far, namely, as the law is an institution which does not cancel the curse so pronounced and procure justification ; for otherwise faith must have been its principle, which is not the case (see the sequel). The law is consequently, *in principle*, not the means by the use of which a man can attain to justification.[1] Χριστός in ver. 13 corresponds to the emphatically prefixed ἐν νόμῳ (what *by the law* is not done, *Christ* has effected) ; therefore ἐν is not to be understood [2] as : *in*, in the condition of of Judaism, or in the sense of the *rule* (Wieseler), but as : *through, by means of.* — παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ] *judice Deo*, opposed to the judgment of men.[3] — ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται] an *aphorism of Scripture* well known to the readers, which therefore did not need any formula of quotation.[4] The passage is from Hab. ii. 4, according to the LXX. (ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστ. μου ζήσεται, or, according to A. : ὁ δὲ δίκ. μου ἐκ π. μ. ζ.), where it is said : *The righteous* (צַדִּיק) *shall through his fidelity* (towards God) *become partaker of* (theocratic) *life-blessedness.* The apostle, glancing back from the Messianic *fulfilment* of this saying—which he had everywhere in view, and experienced most deeply in his own consciousness—to the Messianic destination of it, recognizes as its *prophetic* sense : "*He who is righteous through faith* (in Christ) *shall obtain* (Messianic) *life.*" Comp. on Rom. i. 17. In so doing Paul, following the LXX., which very often renders אמונה by πίστις, had the more reason for retaining this word, because the faithful self-surrender to God (to His promise and grace) is the fundamental essence of faith in Christ ; and he might join ἐκ πίστεως to ὁ δίκαιος, because the *life* ἐκ πίστεως presupposes no other *righteousness* than that ἐκ πίστεως. Here also, as in Rom. *l.c.* (otherwise in Heb. x. 38), the words ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως are to be connected,[5] and not ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεταιο :[6] for Paul desires to point out the cause of the *righteousness*, and not that of the life of the righteous, although this has the same cause ; and in ver. 12, ὁ ποιήσας αὐτά stands in contrast not to ὁ δίκαιος merely, but to ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως.[7] Paul, however, did not write ὁ ἐκ πίστεως δίκαιος or δίκαιος ὁ ἐκ πίστεως, because this important saying was well known and sanctioned by usage in the order of the words given by the LXX. ; so that he involuntarily abstained from the freedom of dealing elsewhere manifested by him in quoting from Scripture. The *grammatical* correctness of the junction of ἐκ πίστ. to δίκαιος is evident from the fact that the phrase δικαιοῦσθαι ἐκ πίστ. is used ; comp. ver. 8.

---

[1] Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 27.

[2] See Kühner, II. p. 626.

[3] For if we take Bengel's explanation, the δῆλον will not suit well the following words, *because they form an utterance of Scripture.* We should expect possibly γέγραπται, so that then the first ὅτι would have to be understood as : ἵνα εἰδῆτε, ὅτι, "that ye may see that" (Fritzsche, *Quaest. Luc.* p. 59 ff. ; Schaef. *ad Dem.* II. p. 71).

[4] *In loc.* and *Schriftbew.* I. p. 615 f.

[5] See especially Buttmann, *ad Plat. Crit.* p. 106 ; Bast, *Palaeogr.* p. 804.

[6] Comp. Rom. i. 17.

[7] Comp., on the contrary, iv. 3–5 ; Rom. viii. 3 ; 2 Cor. v. 21.

[8] Erasmus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, and others.

Ver. 12. Minor proposition ; δέ the syllogistic *atqui.* See on ver. 11. — οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πίστεως, *is not of faith*, is not an institution which has faith as the principle of its nature and action. Comp. ver. 10. — ἀλλ' ὁ ποιήσας κ.τ.λ.] *but he who shall have done them* (namely, the προστάγματα and κρίματα, "statutes and judgments" of God, Lev. xviii. 5) *shall live* (shall have life in the Messiah's kingdom) *through them*, so that they form, in this way of *doing*, the channel of obtaining life. Thus in the express words of the law (Lev. xviii. 5), likewise presumed to be familiar to his readers, Paul introduces the nature of the law as contrasted with ἐκ πίστεως. Comp. Rom. x. 5. After ἀλλ', γέγραπται is not (with Schott) to be supplied;[1] but, as the form with the apostrophe indicates, Paul has connected ἀλλ' immediately with ὁ ποιήσας αὐτά, leaving it to the reader not only to explain for himself αὐτά and ἐν αὐτοῖς from his acquaintance with the O. T. context of the saying referred to, but also to complete for himself the connection from the first half of the verse: "The law, however, has not *faith* as its principle; but the *doer* of the commandments—this is the axiom of the law—shall live by them."[2]

---

[1] On this ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου (Rom. viii. 3), comp. Lipsius, *Rechtfertigungsl.* p. 68 ; Neander. II. p. 658 ff. ; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 286 f.

[2] With Rückert, de Wette, and others.

[3] Comp. Rom. ii. 13 ; Winer, p. 369 [E. T. 492].

[4] D* E F G, Syr. Erp. It., have γέγραπται γάρ before ὅτι, F G also omitting δῆλον. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 27 ; Rom. ix. 7 ; and besides Heng. *in loc.*

[5] Chrysostom, Cajetanus, Pareus, Bengel, Baumgarten, Zachariae, Michaelis, Semler, Morus, Griesbach, Knapp, Rückert, Winer, *Gramm.* p. 129, Hilgenfeld, Reithmayr, Hoelemann, and others.

[6] So most of the older expositors, following Jerome and Augustine ; also Borger, Winer, Matthies, Schott, de Wette, Wieseler, Ewald, Holsten, Hofmann, Matthias.

[7] Compare, besides, Hoelemann, *l.c.* p. 41 f.

Ver. 13. Connection: "*Through the law* no one becomes righteous (vv. 11, 12); *Christ* has redeemed us from the curse."[3] The *asyndeton* renders the contrast stronger.[4] Rückert[5] reverts to ver. 10, supplying μέν in ver. 10, and δέ in ver. 13. This is incorrect, for Χρίστος finds its appropriate antithesis in the words immediately preceding; and, as in general it is a mistake thus to supply μέν and δέ, it is here the more absurd, because ὅσοι in ver. 10 has expressly received in γάρ its reference to what precedes it. Against Hofmann's interpretation, that ver. 13 is apodosis to vv. 11, 12, see on ver. 11. — ἡμᾶς] applies to the *Jews;* for *these* were under the curse of the law[6] mentioned in ver. 10, and by faith in Christ made themselves partakers of the redemption from that curse accomplished by Him, as Paul had himself experienced. Others have understood it as the Jews *and Gentiles.*[7] But against this view it may be urged, that the Gentiles were not under the curse of the Mosaic law (Rom. ii. 12); that a reference to the natural law as well (Rom. ii. 14, 15) is quite foreign to the context;[8] that the law, even if it had not been done away by Christ, would yet never have related to the Gentiles,[9] because it was the partition-wall between Jew and Gentile (Eph. ii. 14 f.); and lastly, that afterwards in ver. 14 εἰς τὰ ἔθνη is placed in contrast to the ἡμᾶς, and hence it must not be said, with Matthias, that it so far applies to the Gentiles also, since the latter as Christians could not be under obligation to the law,—which, besides, would amount to a very indirect sort of ransom, entirely different from the sense in which it applied to the Jews. — ἐξηγόρασεν] Comp. iv. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23; Eph. i. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 1; Matt. xx. 28; Rev. v. 9; Diod. *Exc.* p. 530. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Polyb. iii. 42. 2. Those who are under obligation to the law as the record of the direct will of God,[10] are subject to the divine curse expressed therein;

---

[1] Comp. also Matthias, who understands even οὐκ ἔστιν as *runs not.*

[2] Comp. on Rom. xv. 3; 1 Cor. i. 31.

[3] See on ver. 11.

[4] Comp. Col. iii. 4.

[5] Comp. also Flatt, Koppe, Schott, Olshausen.

[6] Which is not to be turned into a subjective condition, as Bähr (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, p. 922) wishes, who explains it as the *state of spiritual death*, in consequence of his erroneous view of εὐλογία in ver. 8.

[7] Gomarus, Pareus, Estius, Flatt, Winer, Matthies.

[8] In opposition to Flatt.

[9] In opposition to Winer.

[10] For in the apostle's view everywhere, and here also, the law is *this*, and ver. 19 is not at variance with its being so (in opposition to Ritschl in *d. Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* 1863, p. 523 f.). Comp. on Col. ii. 15.

but from the bond of this curse, from which they could not otherwise have escaped, *Christ* has *redeemed* them, and that by giving up for them His life upon the cross as a λύτρον, "ransom," paid to God the *dator et vindex legis*, "giver and maintainer of the law,"—having by His *mors satisfactoria*, "death for satisfaction," suffered according to God's gracious counsel in obedience to the same,[1] procured for them the forgiveness of sins,[2] so that the curse of the law which was to have come upon them no longer had any reference to them. This *modus*, "mode," of the redemption is here expressed thus: "*by His having become curse for us*," namely, by His crucifixion, in which He actually became the object of the divine ὀργή. The *emphasis* rests on the κατάρα, which is therefore placed at the end and is immediately to be vindicated by a quotation from Scripture. This *abstract*, used instead of the *concrete*, is purposely chosen *to strengthen* the conception, and probably indeed with reference to the קִלְלַת אֱלֹהִים, "accursed of God," Deut. xxi. 23.[3] But κατάρα is used *without the article*, because the object is to express that which Christ has become as regards the *category of quality*—He became *curse*, entered into the position, and into the *de facto* relation, of one visited with the divine wrath; it being obvious from the context that it was in reality the divine curse stipulated in the law, the accomplishment of which He suffered in His death, as is moreover expressly attested in the passage of Scripture that follows.[4] The idea of κατάρα as the curse *of God*—obvious of itself to every reader—forbids us to explain away (with Hofmann) the "becoming a curse" as signifying, not that God accomplished *His* curse on Christ, but that God decreed respecting Christ that He should suffer that which *men* did to Him as fulfilment of the curse of the *law*, which was not incurred by, and did not apply to, Him. The exact real parallel, 2 Cor. v. 21, ought to have prevented any such evasive interpretation. And if Paul had not meant the curse *of God*, which Christ suffered ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν,—as no reader, especially after the passage of Scripture which follows, could understand anything else,—he would have been practising a deception. Christ made sin by *God*, and so suffering the *divine* curse—that is just the foolishness of the cross, which is wiser than men (1 Cor. i. 25). Comp., besides, Rich. Schmidt, *Paulin. Christol.* p. 81, who, however, regards the contents of our passage and of 2 Cor. v. 21 under the point of view of the *cancelling* of sin (sin being viewed as an objective power), and thus comes into contact with Hofmann's theory. — ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν] That ὑπέρ, as in all passages in which the atoning death is spoken of, does not mean *instead of*,[5] see on Rom. v. 6. Comp. on i. 4. The satisfaction which Christ rendered, was rendered *for our benefit;* that it was vicarious,[6] is implied in the circumstances of the case itself, and not in the preposition. The divine curse of the law must have been realized by all, who did not fully satisfy the law to which they were bound (and this no one could do), being compelled to endure the execution of the divine ὀργή, "wrath," on themselves; but for their deliverance from the bond of this curse Christ intervened with His death, inasmuch as He died as *an accursed one*, and thereby, as by a purchase-price, dissolved that relation to the law which implied a curse.[1] This effect depends certainly on the sinlessness of Christ (2 Cor. v. 21), without which His surrendered life could not have been a λύτρον, "ransom" (Matt. xx. 28), and He Himself, by the shedding of His blood, could not have been a ἱλαστήριον, "propitiation" (Rom. iii. 25), because, with guilt of His own, He would have been amenable to the curse on His own account, and not through taking upon Him the guilt of others (John i. 29); but utterly aloof from and foreign to the N. T. is the idea which Hilgenfeld here suggests, that the curse of the law had lost its validity once for all, because it had for once shown itself as an *unrighteous* curse. The death of Christ served precisely to show the *righteousness* of God, which has its expression in the curse of the law.[2] — ὅτι γέγρ. . . . ξύλου is not an epexegesis to γενομ. ὑπ. ἡμ. κατ. (Matthias, who writes ὅ, τι), but is a parenthesis in which the γενόμενος κατάρα, which had just been said of Christ, is vindicated agreeably to Scripture, by Deut. xxi. 23, freely quoted from the LXX.[3] *Accursed* (vis-

---

[1] Rom. v. 19; Phil. ii. 8.

[2] Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14; Rom. iii. 24; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28.

[3] Comp. Thilo, *ad Protev. Jac.* 3, p. 181.

[4] Comp. Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 321, *d;* Kahnis, *Dogm.* I. p. 518 f., III. p. 382; Delitzsch, *z. Hebr.* p. 714.

[5] So here, Bengel, Koppe, Flatt, Rückert, Reithmayr, following earlier expositors; comp. also Lipsius, *Rechtfertigungsl.* p. 134 f.).

[6] As is expressly stated in Matt. xx. 28, 1 Tim. ii. 6, by ἀντί. Comp. Thomasius, *Chr. Pers. u. Werk*, III. 1, p. 88 ff.; Gess, in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* II. 4, III. 4. The less satisfactory is it, therefore, with Schweizer in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 425 ff., to find that the essential import of

---

our passage only amounts to this, that the Mosaic law had been set aside on the appearance of Christianity, and that this setting aside was decisively evinced by the death on the cross. See, on the other hand, Baur in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1859, p. 226 ff., and in his *neut. Theol.* p. 156 f.

[1] Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23; Col. ii. 14.

[2] See on Rom. iii. 25.

[3] The LXX. has κεκατηραμένος ὑπὸ Θεοῦ πᾶς κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου. The ὑπὸ Θεοῦ is also expressed in the Hebrew. Jerome accuses the Jews here also of intentional falsification of the text, alleging that in an anti-Christian interest they had inserted the name of God into the original text. Bähr, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, p. 928 ff., is of opinion that Paul *purposely* omitted ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, so as not to represent Christ as cursed *by God* (with which Hofmann agrees); that He was called cursed only because, through His death, He *appeared* as cursed before all to whom the law was given. But this is incorrect, because the expression is not Paul's, and because, so interpreted, the whole proof adduced would amount only to a *semblance*, and not to a *reality*. Christ has certainly averted from men the curse of God which was ordained in the law (ver. 10), by the fact that He, as the bearer of the divine curse, died while hanging on the cross. Having thus actually become ἐπικατάρατος, He became the propitiatory sacrifice for those who were subject to the law, whom He consequently redeemed from the definite divine curse of the law (ver. 10), so that on the part of God the *actus forensis*, "forensic act," of justification now commenced: and for this reason, although the crucified One was ἐπικατάρατος, Paul could elsewhere represent Him as ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας (Eph. v. 2). Luther aptly remarks: "*Si vis negare eum esse peccatorem et maledictum, negato etiam passum, crucifixum et mortuum,*" "If you want to deny that He is a sinner and cursed, deny also that He suffered, was crucified, and died." The cause of the non-adoption of ὑπὸ Θεοῦ cannot be that Paul, under the influence of a subordinate value assigned to the law as not directly given by God, had the passage imprinted on his mind without ὑπὸ Θεοῦ (Ritschl, *l.c.* p. 526), for he did not entertain any such estimate of its inferior value. We must, in fact, simply abide by the explanation that he quoted *the passage of Scripture from a free recollection* (as is already shown by ἐπικατάρατος and the addition of ὁ), and in doing so, having in view only the "*cursed*" as the *point* of the passage, left unnoticed the entirely obvious ὑπὸ Θεοῦ. In a similar way, in ver. 11, in the quotation Hab. ii. 4, he does not adopt the μου of the LXX.

ited with the wrath of God) *is every one who* (according to the LXX., in which the article is wanting, *every one, if he*) *is hanged on a tree.* The original historical sense of this passage applies to those malefactors who, in order to the aggravation of their punishment, were after their execution publicly hung up on a (probably cross-shaped) stake,[1] but were not allowed to remain hanging over the night, lest such accursed ones should profane the holy land.[2] Now, so far as Christ when put to death hung upon a stake,[3] the predicate ἐπικατάρατος applies also to Him ; and this furnishes the scriptural proof of the preceding γενόμενος κατάρα.

Ver. 14. Divine purpose in Christ's redeeming us (the Jews) from the curse of the law ; *in order that the blessing promised to Abraham* (justification ; see on ver. 8) *might be imparted in Christ Jesus to the Gentiles* (not : *to all peoples*, as Olshausen and Baumgarten-Crusius, following the earlier expositors, take τὰ ἔϑνη, in opposition to the context). So long, namely, as the curse of the law stood in force and consequently the Jews were still subject to this divine curse, the Gentiles could not be partakers of that blessing ; for, according to that promise made to Abraham, it was implied in the preference which in the divine plan of salvation was granted to the Jews (Rom. i. 17, xv. 8, 9, iii. 1, 2, ix. 1–5), that salvation should issue from them and pass over to the Gentiles (comp. Rom. xv. 27 ; John iv. 22, xi. 52). Hence, when Christ by His atoning death redeemed the *Jews* from the curse of the divine law, God, in thus arranging His salvation, must necessarily have had the design that the *Gentiles*, who are expressly named in the promise made to Abraham (ver. 8), should share in the promised justification, and that not in some way through the *law*, as if they were to be subjected to this, but in *Christ Jesus*, through whom in fact the Jews had been *made free* from the curse of the law. The opposite of this liberation of the *Jews* could not exist in God's purpose in regard to the *Gentiles.* Rückert takes a different view of the logical connection (as to which most expositors are silent), in the light of Eph. ii. 14 ff. : "So long as the law continued, an impenetrable wall of partition was set up between the Jewish and the Gentile world ; . . . and just as long it was simply impossible that the blessing should pass over to the Gentiles." But the context speaks not of the *law itself* as having been *done away*, but of the *curse of the law*, from which Jesus had redeemed the Jews ; so that the idea of a *partition-wall*, formed by the *law itself* standing between Jew and Gentile, is not presented to the reader. Usteri thus states the connection : "Christ by His vicarious death has redeemed us (Jews) from the curse of the law, in order that (justification henceforth being to be attained through faith) the Gentiles may become partakers in the blessings of Abraham, *since now there is required for justification a condition possible for all,—namely, faith.*"[4] But since the *point of the possibility* of the justification of the Gentiles is not dealt with in the context, this latter expedient is quite as arbitrarily resorted to, as is Schott's intermingling of the *natural* law, against the threatenings of which faith alone yields protection (Rom. ii. 12 ff., iii. 9 ff.). — εἰς τὰ ἔθνη] might reach *to the Gentiles* (Acts xxi. 17, xxv. 15), that is, *be imparted* to them (Rev. xvi. 2).[1] *Such* was to be the course of the divine way of salvation, *from Israel to the Gentiles.* Observe, that Paul does not say καὶ εἰς τ. ἔθνη, as if the Gentiles were merely an *accessory.* — ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβρ.] the blessing already spoken of, which was pre-announced to Abraham (ver. 8), the opposite of the κατάρα; not therefore *life* (Hofmann), the opposite of which would be θάνατος, but *justification*—by which is meant the benefit itself (Eph. i. 3; Rom. xv. 29), and not the mere *promise* of it (Schott). — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] so that this reception of the blessing depends, and is founded, on Christ (on His redeeming death). The διὰ τῆς πίστεως which follows expresses the matter from the point of view of the *subjective medium*, whilst ἐν Χριστῷ presents the *objective* state of the case—the two elements corresponding to each other at the close of the two sentences of purpose. — ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν κ.τ.λ.] cannot be *subordinated* to the previous sentence of purpose (Rückert), for it contains no benefit specially accruing *to the Gentiles.*[2] It is *parallel* to *the first sentence of purpose* by way of climax.[3] After Paul had expressed the blessed aim which the redeeming death of Christ had in reference to the Gentiles,—namely, that they should become partakers of the εὐλογία of Abraham,—he raises his glance still higher, and sees the reception also of the Holy Spirit (the consequence of justification) as an aim of that redeeming death; but he cannot again express himself in the third person, because, after the justification of the Jews had been spoken of in ver. 13 and the justification of the Gentiles in ver. 14 (ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη . . . Ἰησοῦ), the statement now concerns the justified generally, Jews and Gentiles without distinction: hence the first person, λάβωμεν, is used, the subject of which must be the *Christians*, and not the *Jewish* Christians only.[4] This by no means accidental emergence of the first person, after τὰ ἔθνη had been previously spoken of in the *third*, is incompatible with our taking the reception of the Spirit as *part* of the εὐλογία (Wieseler), or as essentially *identical* with it (Hofmann). — τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος] τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν λαμβάνειν means *to become partakers in the realization of the promise* (Heb. x. 36; Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4); but τοῦ πνεύματος may be either the genitive of the *subject* (*that which is promised by the Spirit*) or of the *object* (*the promised Spirit*). The latter interpretation (comp. Acts ii. 33; Eph. i. 13) is the usual and correct one.[5] For if (with Winer) we should explain it, "*bona illa, quae a divino Spiritu promissa sunt*," the blessings which have been promised by the Divine Spirit" (Luke xxiv.

---

[1] Analogous to our former custom of fastening criminals on the wheel, in order to aggravate the punishment.

[2] Deut. xxi. 23 ; Num. xxv. 4 ; Josh. x. 26 ; 2 Sam. iv. 12. See Lund, *Jüd. Heiligth.* ed. Wolf, p. 536 ; Saalschütz, *Mos. R.* p. 460 f. ; Bähr in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, p. 924 f.

[3] Comp. Acts v. 30, x. 39 ; 1 Pet. ii. 24.

[4] Comp. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact.

---

[1] Comp. on 2 Cor. viii. 13 f.

[2] Paul would have written λάβωσι, which Chrysostom actually read—evidently an alteration arising from misunderstanding.

[3] Comp. Rom. vii. 13; 2 Cor. ix. 3; Eph. vi. 19 f.

[4] Beza, Bengel, Hofmann, and others.

[5] So that τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν is to be referred to the O. T. promise of the communication of the Holy Spirit (Joel iii.; Acts ii. 16),—a promise well known to all the apostle's readers. Hilgenfeld incorrectly holds that "the promise given to *Abraham* is directly designated as an ἐπαγγελία τοῦ πνεύματος (a promise, the substance of which is the πνεῦμα)."

49 ; Acts i. 4), then, in conformity with the context, this expression must refer back to ver. 8 ;[1] and to this the *first* person λάβωμεν would not be suitable, as Paul referred that promise given to Abraham in the Scripture (by the Holy Spirit) to the Gentiles. And if τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος were essentially the same as the εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβρ., it would be entirely devoid of the *explanatory* character of an epexegesis. — διὰ τ. πίστ.] For faith is the *causa apprehendens*, "apprehending cause," both of justification and of the reception of the Spirit ; comp. vv. 2–5, v. 5.

Vv. 15–18. What Paul has previously said concerning justification, not of the law, but of faith, with reference to that promise given to Abraham (vv. 8–14), could only maintain its ground as true before the worshippers of the law, in the event of its being acknowledged that the covenant once entered into with Abraham through that promise was not deprived of validity by the subsequent institution of the law, or subjected to alteration through the entrance of the law. For if this covenant had been done away with or modified by the law, the whole proof previously adduced would come to nothing. Paul therefore now shows *that this covenant had not been invalidated or altered through the Mosaic law.*

Ver. 15.[2] Ἀδελφοί] Expressive of loving urgency, and conciliating with reference to the instruction which follows.[3] How entirely different was it in ver. 1 ! Now the tone of feeling is softened. — κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω] not to be placed in a parenthesis,[4] points to *what follows*—to that which he is just about to say in proof of the immutability of a *divine* διαθήκη, "covenant." The analogy to be adduced from a *human* legal relation is not intended to be excused, but is to be placed in the proper point of view ; for the apostle does not wish to adduce it from his higher standpoint as one enlightened by the Spirit, according to the measure of divinely-revealed wisdom, but he wishes thus to accommodate himself to the *ordinary way among men* (of adducing examples from common life), so as to be perfectly intelligible to his readers (not in order to put them to shame, as Calvin thinks).[5] — ὅμως] *yet.* The *logical* position would be before οὐδείς. A διαθήκη, *although human*, no one yet cancels. Such a *transposition* of the ὅμως (which here intimates a conclusion *à minori*) is not unfrequent in classical authors, and again occurs in the case of Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 7.[6] There is therefore all the less reason for writing it ὁμῶς, *in like manner*,[7] which would be unsuitable, since that which is to be illustrated by the comparison only *follows* (at ver. 17). Rückert[8] takes it in antithetical reference to κατὰ ἄνθρ. λέγω : "I desire to keep only to human relations ; nevertheless," etc. This would be an illogical antithesis. Others, contrary to linguistic usage, make it mean *yet even*,[9] or *quin*

---

[1] προϊδοῦσα ἡ γραφὴ κ.τ.λ. προευηγγελίσατο τῷ Ἀβρ. κ.τ.λ.

[2] As to vv. 15–22, see Hauck in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1862, p. 512 ff.; Matthias, *d. Abschn. d. Gal. Br.* iii. 15–22, Cassel, 1866. As ts vv. 15–29, see Buhl, in the *Luther. Zeitzschr.* 1867, p. 1 ff.

[3] Comp. Rom. x. 1.

[4] Erasmus, Calvin, and many others.

[5] Comp. ἀνθρωπείως and ἀνθροπίνως (Dem. 639. 24, 1122. 2 ; Rom. vi. 19). See generally on Rom. iii. 5 ; 1 Cor. ix. 8 ; and van Hengel, *Annot.* p. 211 f.

[6] See on this passage.

[7] Morus, Rosenmüller, Jatho

[8] So also Olshausen and Windischmann.

[9] Grotius, Zachariae, Matthies.

imo,[1] and the like. — κεκυρωμένην] *ratified*, made legally valid, Gen. xxiii. 20; 4 Macc. vii. 9; Dem. 485. 13; Plat. *Pol.* x. p. 620 E; Polyb. v. 49. 6; Andoc. *de myst.* § 84, p. 11; comp. on 2 Cor. ii. 8. — διαθήκην] not *testament* (Heb. ix. 16 f.), as the Vulgate, Luther, Erasmus, and many others, including Olshausen, render it, quite in opposition to the context; nor, in general, *voluntary ordainment*, *arrangement* (Winer, Matthies, Usteri, Schott, Hofmann: "destination as to anything, which we apply for one's benefit," Holsten, following earlier expositors); but in the *solemn* biblical signification of בְּרִית, *covenant* (Jerome, Beza, Calvin, Zachariae, Semler, Koppe, Flatt, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Matthias, Reithmayr, and others; also Ewald: "*contract*"), as in iv. 24 and all Pauline passages. The emphatic prefixing of ἀνθρώπου points to the *majus*, "greater," the διαθήκη *of God;* and God had entered into a *covenant* with Abraham, by giving him the promises (ver. 17).[2] The *singular* (ἀνθρώπου) is not opposed to this view; on the contrary, since ἀνθρώπου διαθήκη is put as analogue of the διαθήκη *of God* (which God has established), there could, in accordance with this latter, be only *one* contracting party designated: a ratified covenant, *which a man has established.* The *ratification*, as likewise follows from the διαθήκη *of God*, is not to be considered as an act accomplished by a third party; but the covenant is legally valid by the definitive and formal conclusion of the parties themselves who make the agreement with one another. — οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ ἢ ἐπιδιατ.] viz. no third party. Such an interference would indeed be possible in itself, and not inconsistent with the idea of a covenant (as Hofmann objects). But cases of this sort would be exceptional, and, in the *general legal axiom* expressed by Paul, might well be left unnoticed.[3] That οὐδείς is not the same subject as ἀνθρώπου (Holsten[4]), is evident both from the expression in itself, and from the application in ver. 17, where the ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ corresponds to the ἀνθρώπου and the (personified) νόμος, which comes in as a third person, to the οὐδείς. — ἢ ἐπιδιατάσσεται] or *adds further stipulations thereto*, which were not contained in the covenant. That the ἐπί in the word ἐπιδιατάσσεται (not occurring elsewhere) denotes against (Schott), is inconsistent with the analogy of ἐπιδιατίθημι, ἐπιδιαγινώσκω, ἐπιδιακρίνω, and so forth;[5] in that case ἀντιδιατάσσεται must have been used. Erasmus, Winer, Hauck, and others wish at least to define the nature of the additions referred to as coming into conflict with the will of the author of the διαθήκη or changing it; but this is arbitrary. The words merely affirm: *no one prescribes any addition thereto;* this is altogether against the general rule of law, let the additions be what they may.[6]

---

[1] Wolf.

[2] Comp. Gen. xvii. 7; Ex. ii. 24; Lev. xxvi. 42; Luke i. 72; Acts iii. 25; 2 Macc. i. 2; Ecclus. xliv. 20, 22.

[3] On ἀθετεῖν διαθήκ., *to do away a covenant*, *irritum facere*, comp. 1 Macc. xv. 27; 2 Macc. xiii. 25; Polyb. xv. 1. 9, iii. 29. 2, xv. 8. 9.

[4] "Yet in the sphere of the human no one cancels his voluntary disposition, which has become legally valid." Matthies also identifies the subject in οὐδείς with the founder of the διαθήκη.

[5] Comp. Joseph. *Bell.* ii. 2. 3, ἀξιῶν τῆς ἐπιδιαθήκης τὴν διαθήκην εἶναι κυριωτέραν, *Antt.* xvii. 9. 4.

[6] Chrysostom aptly remarks: μὴ τολμᾷ τις ἀνατρέψαι μετὰ ταῦτα ἐλθὼν ἢ προσθεῖναι τι, τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν· ἢ ἐπιδιατάσσεται, "No one coming after these things ventures to refute or to add anything, for this is: ἢ, ἐπιδιατασσεται."

Ver. 16. This verse is usually considered as minor proposition to ver. 15, so that vv. 15–17 contain a complete syllogism, which is, however, interrupted by the exegetical gloss *οὐ λέγει κ.τ.λ.*, and is then resumed by *τοῦτο δὲ λέγω* in ver. 17.[1] But against this view it may be urged, (1) that the minor proposition in ver. 16 must necessarily, in a logical point of view,—as corresponding to the emphatic *ὅμως ἀνθρώπου* in ver. 15,—bring into prominence the *divine character* of the promises, and must have been expressed in some such form as *Θεὸς δὲ τῷ Ἀβρ.*; and (2) that the explanation as to *καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ*, so carefully and emphatically brought in (not merely "allusive," Hilgenfeld), would be here entirely aimless and irrelevant, because it would be devoid of all reference to and influence on the argument. The train of ideas is really as follows:[2]—After Paul has stated in ver. 15 that even a man's legally valid covenant is not invalidated or furnished with additions by any one, he cannot immediately attach the conclusion intended to be deduced from this, viz., that a valid covenant of God is not annulled by the law coming afterwards; but he must first adduce the circumstance which, in the case in question, has an *essential bearing on* this proof,—that the promises under discussion were issued not to Abraham only, *but at the same time to his descendants also*, that is, *to Christ*. From this essential circumstance it is, in fact, clear that that covenant was not to be a mere temporary contract, simply made to last *up to the time of* the law. Accordingly, the purport of vv. 15–17 is this: "Even a man's covenant legally completed remains uncancelled and without addition (ver. 15). But the circumstance which conditions and renders incontestable the conclusion to be thence deduced is, that the promises were spoken not merely to Abraham, but also to his seed, by which, as is clear from the *singular τῷ σπέρματι*, is meant *Christ* (ver. 16). And now—to complete my conclusion drawn from what I have said in vv. 15 and 16—what I mean is this: A covenant previously made with legal validity by God is not rendered invalid by the law, which came into existence so long afterwards" (ver. 17). — *τῷ δὲ Ἀβρ. ἐῤῥέθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι κ. τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ*] The emphasis is laid on *καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ*, the point which is here brought into prominence as the further specific foundation of the proof to be adduced. This element essential to the proof lies in the destination of Christ as *the organ of fulfilment*; in the case of a promise which had been given not merely to the ancestor himself, but also to Christ, the fulfiller, it was not at all possible to conceive an *ἀθέτησις* by the law.[3] The passage of the O. T. to which Paul refers in *καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ*, is considered by most expositors, following Tertullian (*de carne Christi*, 22) and Chrysostom, to be Gen. xxii. 18: *ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς*, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." But, from the words *οὐ λέγει· καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν κ.τ.λ.* which follow, it is evident that Paul was thinking of a passage in which *καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου* is *expressly* written. Hence (with Estius and Bengel, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, Buhl) the passages Gen. xiii. 15, xvii. 8, are rather to be assumed as those referred to,—a view confirmed by the expression *κληρονομία* in ver. 18.[1] Comp. Rom. iv. 13.—*ἐῤῥέθησαν*[2]] *they were spoken*, that is, *given*, as some min., Eusebius and Theophylact, actually read *ἐδόθησαν*. The *datives* simply state *to whom* the promises were spoken, not: *in reference to whom* (so Matthias),—an interpretation which was the less likely to occur to the reader, well acquainted as he was with the fact that the promise was spoken directly to Abraham, who at the same time represented his *σπέρμα*.—*αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι*] in the *plural:* for the promise in question was given *on several occasions* and under various modifications, even as regards the contents; and indeed Paul himself here refers to a place and form of promise different from that mentioned above in ver. 8. In *καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ* he finds that *Christ* is meant; hence he adds the following gloss (Midrasch): *οὐ λέγει· καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν κ.τ.λ.*, in which the *singular* form of the expression is asserted by him to be significant, and the conclusion is thence drawn that only *one* descendant (not: only one *class* of descendants, namely the spiritual children of Abraham, as, following Augustine, Cameron and others, Olshausen and Tholuck, *d. A. T. im neuen T.* p. 65 ff. ed. 6, also Jatho, hold) is intended, namely *Christ*. That this inference is purely rabbinical,[3] and without objective force as a proof, is evident from the fact that in the original text זֶרַע is written, and this, in every passage in the O. T. where it expresses the idea of *progenies*, "progeny," is used in the *singular*,[4] whether the posterity consists of many or of one only.[5] Also the later Hebrew and Chaldee usage of the plural form in the sense of *progenies*[3] does not depend, any more than the Greek use of *σπέρματα*,[7] on the circumstance that, in contradistinction, the singular is to be understood *ὡς ἐφ' ἑνός*.[8] The classical use of *αἵματα* is analogous (comp. on John i. 13). Moreover, the original sense of these promises, and also the *τῷ σπέρματι* of the LXX., undoubtedly apply to the posterity of Abraham *generally:* hence it is only in so far as Christ is the theocratic culmination, the goal and crown of this series of descendants, that the promises were spoken to Him; but to discover this reference in the *singular καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου* was a mere feat of the rabbinical subtlety, which was still retained by the apostle from his youthful culture as a characteristic element of his national training, without detriment to the Holy Spirit which he had, and to the revelations which had been vouchsafed to him. Every attempt to show that Paul has not here allowed himself any rabbinical interpretation of this sort[1] is incompatible with the language itself, and conflicts with the express ὅς ἐστι Χριστός; which clearly shows that we are not to understand *σπερμάτων* with *ἐπὶ πολλῶν*, nor *σπέρματος* with *ἐφ' ἑνός* (Hofmann, Buhl), but that the contrast between many *persons* and one *person* is the point expressed. But the truth itself, which the gloss of the apostle is intended to serve, is entirely independent of this gloss, and rests upon the *Messianic tenor* of the promises in question, not on the *singular τῷ σπέρματι. — οὐ λέγει*] *sc.* [See Note XLVI., p. 160.] Θεός, which is derived from the historical reference of the previous *ἐῤῥέθησαν*, so well known to the reader.[2] — *ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν*] *as referring to many individuals*, in such a manner that He intends and desires to express a plurality of persons. On *ἐπί*, *upon*, that is, *in reference to*, with the genitive along with verbs of speaking, see Heindorf, *ad Plat. Charm.* p. 62; Bernhardy, p. 248; Ast. *Lex. Plat.* I. p. 767. — ὅς ἐστι Χριστός] *which σπέρμα*, denoting a single individual, *is Christ.* The feebly attested reading ὅ is a mistaken grammatical alteration; for how often does the gender of the relative correspond by attraction to the predicative substantive.[3] Χριστός is the *personal Christ Jesus*, not, as some, following Irenaeus[4] and Augustine,[5] have explained it: *Christ and His church*,[6] or *the church* alone.[7] Such a *mystical sense* of Χριστός must necessarily have been suggested by the context (as in 1 Cor. xii. 12); here, however, the very contrast between *πολλῶν* and *ἑνός* is decidedly against it.[8] Ver. 29 also is *against*, and not in favor of, this explanation; because the inference of this verse depends on the very fact that *Christ Himself* is the *σπέρμα τοῦ Ἀβρ.* (see on ver. 29). The whole explanation is a very superfluous device, the mistaken ingenuity of which (especially in the case of Tholuck and Hofmann) appears in striking contrast to the clear literal tenor of the passage.[9] It is not, however, Christ in his *pre-human* existence, in so far as He *according to the Spirit* already bore sway in the patriarchs (1 Cor. x. 1 ff.), who is here referred to, because it is only as the *λόγος ἔνσαρκος*, "the incarnate word," that He can be the descendant of Abraham (Matt. i. 1; Rom. i. 3). Comp. ver. 19.

---

[1] See Morus, Koppe, Rückert, Schott, de Wette, Hilgenfeld.

[2] Comp. also Wieseler.

[3] Comp. also Holsten, *z. Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 204.

---

[1] The correct view is found even in Origen, *Comment. in Ep. ad Rom.* iv. 4, *Opp.* IV. p. 532: "Ipse enim (apostolus) haec de Christo dicta esse interpretatur, cum dixit: 'Scriptum est, *tibi dabo terram hanc et semini tuo.* Non dixit: et seminibus, tanquam in multis, sed semini tuo, tanquam in uno, qui est Christus,'" "For the apostle himself interprets these things as spoken of Christ, when he said: it has been written: 'To thee and to thy seed will I give this land.' He said not: 'and to seed,' as in many, but as in one, who is Christ." Comp. also p. 618, and *Homil.* 9 *in Genes. Opp.* II. p. 85; and earlier, Irenaeus, *Haer.* v. 32. 2; later, especially Jerome.

[2] As to this form, which has preponderant attestation (Lachm. Tisch.), comp. on Rom. ix. 12; Kühner, I. p. 810, ed. 2.

[3] Surenhusius, καταλλ. p. 84 f.; Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 736; Döpke, *Hermeneut.* I. p. 176 ff.

[4] In 1 Sam. viii. 15, זַרְעֵיכֶם are *segetes vestrae*, "your crops."

[5] Gen. iv. 25; 1 Sam. i. 11; Targ. Ps. xviii. 26, where Isaac is called Abraham's זרע. In the so-called Protevangelium also, Gen. iii. 15, the LXX. translators have referred σπέρμα, "seed," to an individual (to a son); for they translate, αὐτός σου τηρήσει κεφαλήν. But it does not thence follow that this subject was the Messiah, to whom the יְשׁוּפְךָ, correctly understood by the LXX., but wrongly by the Vulgate (*conteret*, "bruise"), is not suitable. The Messianic reference of the passage lies in the *enmity against the serpent* here established as the expression of a moral idea, the final victorious issue of which was the subject-matter of the Messianic hope, and was brought about through the work of the Messiah. Comp. Hengstenberg, *Christol.* I. p. 26 ff.; Ewald, *Jahrb.* II. p. 160 f.; also Schultz, *alttest. Theol.* I. p. 466 f.

[6] See Geiger in the *Zeitschr. d. morgenl. Gesellsch.* 1858, p. 307 ff.

[7] Soph. *O. C.* 606. 1277; *O. R.* 1246; Aesch. *Eum.* 909.

[8] Comp. 4 Macc. xviii. 1: ὦ τῶν Ἀβραμαίων σπερμάτων ἀπόγονοι παῖδες Ἰσραηλῖται, πείθεσθε τῷ νόμῳ τούτῳ, "children of Israel, descendants of the seeds of Abraham, obey this law."

---

[1] See among recent expositors, particularly Philippi in the *Mecklenb. Zeitschr.* 1855, p. 519 ff.: comp. also Hengstenberg, *Christol.* I. p. 50 f.; Tholuck, *l.c.*, and Hofmann.

[2] Comp. Eph. iv. 8, v. 14.

[3] See Kühner, II. p. 505.

[4] *Haer.* v. 32. 2.

[5] *Ad* iii. 29, *Opp.* IV. p. 384.

[6] Beza, Gomarus, Crell, Drusius, Hammond, Locke, and others; also Tholuck, Olshausen, Philippi, *l.c.*, Hofmann.

[7] Calvin, Clericus, Bengel, Ernesti, Döderlein, Nösselt, and others.

[8] See also vv. 19, 22, 24, 27, 28.

[9] Tholuck holds that in ver. 16 Paul desired to show that the promises could not possibly extend to "the posterity of Abraham *in every sense*," and that consequently the *natural* posterity was not included; that the *singular* points rather to a *definite* posterity, namely the *believing.* The latter are taken along with *Christ* as an unity, and, partly as the spiritual successors of the patriarch, partly in their oneness with

Ver. 17. Result of vv. 15 and 16, emphatically introduced by *τοῦτο δὲ λέγω*, *but this which follows* (see on 1 Cor. i. 12), *I say* as the conclusion drawn from what is adduced in vv. 15 and 16 : *A covenant which has been previously made valid* (ratified) by God, *the law . . . does not annul.* *What* covenant is here intended, is well known from the connection, namely, the covenant made by God with Abraham, through His giving to him, and to his *σπέρμα* included along with him, the promises in Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18 (ver. 8), xiii. 15, xvii. 8 (ver. 16). The *κύρωσις* (comp. on ver. 15) is not any separate act following the institution of the covenant, but was implied in the very promises given : through them the covenant became valid. The *προ* in *προκεκυρ.* is correlative with the subsequent *μετα*, and therefore signifies : *previously, ere the law existed.* — *ὁ μετὰ τετρακόσια κ.τ.λ.*] cannot be intended to denote a comparatively *short* time (Koppe), which is not suggested by the context ; but its purport is : The law, which came into existence *so long a time after*, cannot render invalid a covenant, which had been validly instituted so long previously by God and consequently had already subsisted so long. "Magnitudo intervalli auget promissionis auctoritatem," "The greatness of the interval increases the authority of the promise," Bengel. According to Hofmann, the statement of this length of time is intended to imply that the law was something *new* and *different*, which could not be held *as an element forming part of the promise.* But this was obvious of itself from the contrast between promise and law occupying the whole context, and, moreover, would not be dependent on a longer or shorter interval. *With regard to the number* 430, Paul gets it from Ex. xii. 40 (in Gen. xv. 13 and Acts vii. 6 the *round* number 400 is used) ; but in adopting it he does not take into account that this number specifies merely *the duration of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt.* Consequently the number here, taken by itself, contains a chronological inaccuracy ; but Paul follows the statement of the LXX., which differs from the original text—the text of the LXX. being well known to and current among his readers—without entering

---

the great Scion proceeding from his family, they constitute the descendants of Abraham. But in this case Paul, instead of ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, must at least have written ὡς ἐπὶ πάντων; instead of ὡς ἐφ' ἑνός, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἑνός; and instead of ὅς ἐστι Χριστός, he must have written ὅ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία σὺν Χριστῷ. — According to Hofmann, *in loc.* (not quite the same in his *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 107 f.), Paul, following the analogy of Gen. iv. 25 and thinking in *τοῖς σπέρμασιν* of *several posterities by the side of each other*, lays stress on the *oneness* of Abraham's posterity expressed in the *singular*, the expression in the singular serving him only as the *shortest means* (?) for asserting a fact testified to by Scripture generally : but, on the other hand, he has, *by means of estimating* this nnit of posterity *in the light of the history of redemption*, been able, and indeed obliged, to interpret *τῷ σπέρματί σου* as referring to *Christ*, the promised Saviour, *without thereby maintaining that this expression in the singular* could signify *only an individual, and not a race of many members.* But in this way everything which we are expected to read in the plain words is imported into them, and artificially imposed upon them, by the expositor. Besides, in Gen. iv. 25 *σπέρμα ἕτερον* means nothing more than *another son.*

further into this point of chronology, which was foreign to his aim. In Ex. xii. 40 the LXX. has ἡ δὲ κατοίκησις τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσρ. ἣν κατῴκησαν ἐν γῇ Αἰγ. καὶ ἐν γῇ Χαναάν, "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan was" (the words κ. ἐ. γ. Χ. are wanting in the Hebrew), ἔτη τετρακόσια τριάκοντα, "four hundred and thirty years." This text of the LXX. was based upon a different reckoning of the time—a reckoning which is found in the Samaritan text and in Joseph. *Antt.* ii. 15. 3.[1] The interval between God's promise to Abraham and the migration of Jacob to Egypt—an interval omitted in the 430 years—cannot indeed be exactly determined, but may be reckoned at about 200 years; so that, if Paul had wished to give on his own part a definition of the time, he would not have exceeded bounds with 600 years instead of 430. The attempts to bring the 430 years in our passage into agreement with the 430 years in Ex. xii. 40 are frustrated by the unequivocal tenor of both passages.[2] — γεγονώς] is not said *ad postponendam legem*, "for postponing the law" (see, on the contrary, John i. 17), as Bengel thinks ("non dicit *data*, quasi lex fuisset, antequam *data* sit," "he does not say *given*, as though it had been law before it was given"); for *every* law only *comes into existence* as law with the act of legislation.—On ἀκυροῖ, *invalidates*, *overthrows*, comp. Matt. xv. 6; Mark vii. 13; 3 Esr. vi. 32; Diod. Sic. xvi. 24; Dion. H. vi. 78; and ἄκυρον ποιεῖν, in more frequent use among Greek authors. — εἰς τὸ καταργ. τὴν ἐπαγγ.] Aim of the ἀκυροῖ: *in order to do away the promise* (by which the διαθήκη was completed), to render it ineffective and devoid of result. Comp. Rom. iv. 14. "Redditur autem inanis, si vis conferendae haereditatis ab ea ad legem transfertur," "But it is rendered ineffectual, if the power of conferring the inheritance be transferred from it to the law," Bengel. Observe once more the *personification* of the law.

Ver. 18. "I am right in denying, that through the law the διαθήκη passes out of force and the promise is to cease." The proof depends on the antithetical relation between law and promise, whereby the working of the one excludes the like working of the other. *For if the possession of the Messianic salvation proceeds from the law*, which must have been the case if God's covenant with Abraham had lost its validity by means of the law, *then this possession comes no longer from promise*,—a case which, although necessary on that supposition, cannot occur, as is evident from the precedent of Abraham, to whom salvation was given by God *through promise*. The mode of conclusion adopted in Rom. iv. 14 is similar. — ἐκ νόμου] so that the law is the institution which causes this result (in the way of following its commandments). Comp. on ἐν νόμῳ, ver. 11. — ἡ κληρονομία] *the possession*, נַחֲלָה, refers in the theocratic-historical sense of the O. T. to the land of Canaan and its several portions (Deut. iv. 21 ; Josh. xiii. 23) ; but in its N. T. sense, the conception of the κληρονομία is elevated to the idea of its Messianic fulfilment (Matt. v. 5), so that *the kingdom of the Messiah* and the whole of its fulness of salvation and glory are understood thereby (1 Cor. vi. 9 ; Gal. v. 21 ; Eph. v. 5 ; Acts xx. 32, *et al.*).[1] So also here ; and Paul uses this word (not ἡ σωτηρία, ἡ ζωή, or the like) because he has previously (see on ver. 16) referred to passages in which the κληρονομία (that is, according to this Christian idealizing of the O. T. historical sense : *the kingdom of the Messiah*) is promised. — οὐκέτι] The one relation, if it exists, cancels the other. It is (in opposition to Koppe) the *logical* (not historical) *no longer*. Comp. Rom. vii. 17, xi. 6. — δι' ἐπαγγελίας] *by means of promise*, so that in his case the possession of the Messianic salvation is the fulfilment (by way of grace) of a promise, and not the possible result (by way of reward) of rendering prescribed services, and the like, which fall under the idea of the νόμος. — κεχάρισται] *sc.* τὴν κληρονομίαν *donavit* (Vulgate), *bestowed by way of gift* (the contrast to ὀφείλημα, Rom. iv. 4, 16), namely, as a future possession to be realized at the time of the παρουσία (Matt. viii. 11). On χαρίζεσθαί τινί τι, comp. Rom. viii. 32 ; 1 Cor. ii. 12 ; Phil. i. 29, ii. 9 ; Acts xxvii. 24 ; Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 6. 22 ; Polyb. xvi. 24. 9. Without supplying anything, Schott and Matthias render : To Abraham God has, through promise, *been gracious.* Comp. Holsten : He has *bestowed a favor* on him. But the supplying of τὴν κληρονομίαν harmonizes best with the immediate context and the logical relation of the two divisions of the verse, the second of which forms the *propositio minor*, and therefore, like the *major*, must speak of the κληρονομία.[2] Caspari,[3] following classical usage, but not that of the N. T., has wrongly taken κεχάρισται in a *passive* sense, so that *God* is conceived as the inheritance. This is in opposition to the context, and also against the view of the N. T. generally, according to which the κληρονομία proceeds from God (Rom. viii. 17), and is not God Himself, but eternal life (ver. 21 ; Tit. iii. 7 ; Matt. xix. 29, *et al.*), the kingdom of the Messiah (v. 21 ; 1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 50 ; Jas. ii. 5), and its salvation (Rom. i. 16) and dominion (Rom. iv. 13 f. ; Matt. v. 5 ; 2 Tim. ii. 12).

---

[1] See Tychsen, *Exc.* X. p. 148.

[2] *E.g.*, Grotius: The time in Ex. xii. 40 is reckoned from *Abraham's* journey to Egypt. Perizonius, *Orig. Aeg.* 20; and Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 736. The 430 years do not begin until after the period of the promises, that is, after the time of the patriarchs, and of Jacob in particular. Bengel, *Ordo temp.* 162: The *terminus a quo* is the birth of Jacob. Comp. Olshausen: Paul reckons from Jacob and his journey into Egypt. In like manner Hofmann: The *terminus a quo* is the time "at which the promise given to Abraham was *at all repeated*;" also Hauck: "From Jacob, as far as the pure, genuine σπέρμα Ἀβρ. reached."

Ver. 19.[4] After Paul has shown in vv. 15–18 that the law does not abolish the far earlier covenant of promise, he might very naturally be met by the inquiry, "According to this view, then, what sort of end is left to be served by the law in connection with the history of salvation ?" Hence he himself raises this question and answers it. — τί οὖν ὁ νόμος] *sc.* ἐστι : *how does it stand therefore* (if it is the case that the law does not abolish the covenant of promise) *with the law ?* A general question, in which, to judge from the answer that follows, the apostle had in view the *purpose* for which God gave the law. On the neuter τί, with a nominative following, comp. 1 Cor. iii. 5 (in the correct reading) : τί οὖν ἐστιν Ἀπολλῶς, "What then is Apollos ?" and see Stallbaum, *ad Gorg.* p. 501 E ; Bernhardy, p. 336 f. Following J. Cappellus, Schott (also Matthies, though undecidedly, Jatho and Wieseler) takes τί for διὰ τί ; very unnecessarily, however, and in opposition to the constant use of the τί οὖν so frequently recurring in Paul's writings (Rom. iii. 1, iv., *et al.;* comp. Gal. iv. 15). — τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη] *for the sake of transgressions it was added* ; that is, in order that the transgressions of the law might be brought out as real, it was, after the covenant of promise was already in existence, superadded to the latter (παρεισῆλθεν, Rom. v. 20). The law namely, because it gives occasion to the potency of sin in man to bring about in him all evil desire (Rom. vii. 5, 8), and nevertheless is too weak as a counter-power to oppose this sinful development (Rom. viii. 3), is the δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας (1 Cor. xv. 56 ; and see Rom. vii. 7 ff.) ; but sin—which, although existing since Adam (Rom. v. 13), is yet increased by that provocation of the law—has only come to assume the definite character of παράβασις in virtue of the existence of the law and its relation thereto (Rom. iv. 15). The same purpose of the law is expressed in Rom. v. 20, but without the stricter definition of sin as παράβασις. Accordingly, τῶν παραβ. χάριν is not (with Wetstein) to be rationalized to this effect : "Lex sine dubio eo consilio lata est, ut servaretur, ὑπακοῆς χάριν ; vitio tamen hominum evenit, ut peccata multiplicarentur," "Without doubt the law was given to be kept, viz., for obedience ; by man's fault, however, the result was that sins were multiplied." This is in itself correct (comp. Rom. vii. 12), but is irrelevant here, where the point in question is the position of the law in connection with the divine plan of salvation, the final aim of which is redemption. The real idea of the apostle is, that the emergence of sins—namely, in the penal, wrath-deserving (Rom. iv. 15), moral form of *transgressions*—which the law brought about, was *designed* by God (who must indeed have foreseen this effect) when He gave the law, and designed in fact as a mediate end in reference to the future redemption ; for the evil was to become truly great, that it might nevertheless be outdone by grace (Rom. v. 20). The result, which the law, according to experience, has on the whole effected, and by which it has proved itself the δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας (comp. also 2 Cor. iii. 6), could not be otherwise than the *aim* of God.[1] Luther (1519) strikingly remarks : "Ut remissio propter salutem, ita praevaricatio propter remissionem, ita lex propter transgressionem," "as forgiveness on account of salvation, so violation of duty on account of forgiveness, and the law on account of forgiveness." Observe, further, the *article* before παραβ., which summarily comprehends, as having really that character, the transgressions arising and existing since the giving of the law.[2] Others[3] consider that by τῶν παραβ. χάριν *the recognition of sins* is expressed as the aim of the law.[4] But (1) this idea could not have been expressed by the mere *τῶν παραβ. χάριν* ; for although *χάριν* is not always exclusively used in its original sense, *for the sake of*, *in favor of*, but may also be taken simply as *on account of*,[1] still, in order to be intelligible, Paul must have written *τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν* as signifying : in order to bring sins to recognition *as transgressions*. And (2) the point of the *recognition* of sin was entirely foreign to this passage ; for in *τῶν παραβ. χάριν* Paul desires to call attention to the fact that the law, according to the divine plan, was intended to produce exactly the objective, actual (not merely the subjective) opposite of the *δικαιοσύνη* (comp. vv. 21, 22). On account of this connection also the interpretation of many expositors, "for repressing transgressions," is wholly to be rejected, because opposed to the context.[2] This view is decidedly disposed of by the expression *παραβάσεων*, since *παραβάσεις* as such could only come into existence *with* the law (Rom. iv. 15); previously there were sins, but no transgressions,—a view with which Rom. v. 14 does not conflict, because the matter in question there is the transgression of a quite definite, positive command of God. *The two* last interpretations are *combined* by Flatt and Schott, as also by Reiche, following older expositors,[3] — a course inconsistent with hermeneutical principles in general, and here in fact involving an amalgamation of *two erroneous views*. [See Note XLVII., p. 160.] — *προσετέθη*] *it was added*, is not inconsistent with what was said in ver. 15, *οὐδεὶς . . . ἐπιδιατάσσεται*, because in the latter general proposition under *οὐδείς third* persons are thought of. The law, moreover, was not given as *ἐπιδιαθήκη* (see on ver. 15), but as *another* institution, which, far from being a *novella* to the *διαθήκη*, was only to be a temporary intermediate measure in the divine plan of salvation, to minister to the final fulfilment of the promise. See the sequel, and comp. Rom. v. 20, x. 4. — *ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθη τὸ σπέρμα κ.τ.λ.*] *terminus ad quem*, "goal," of the merely provisional duration of this added institute. But these words are neither to be connected, in disregard of their position, with *διαταγείς*,[4] nor to be placed in a parenthesis ; for the construction is not interrupted. As to *ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθη*, *usque dum venerit*, "until it should come," comp. on Rom. xi. 25. According to the general usage of the N. T.,[5] the *subjunctive*, and not the *optative*,[6] is used. Paul has *not* put *ἄν*, because there was no idea in his mind of any circumstances which could have hindered the event.[7] — *τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπήγγ.*]

---

[1] Comp. on Rom. iv. 13 ; Eph. i. 11.

[2] Ver. 18 is a *syllogismus conditionalis*, "conditional syllogism," of the nature of a dilemma, the conclusion of which, because self-obvious, is not expressed.

[3] In *d. Strassb. Beitr.* 1854, p. 206 ff.

[4] On ver. 19, see Stölting, *Beiträge z. Exegese d. Paul. Br.* 1869, p. 50 ff.

---

[1] Comp. Ritschl, p. 74 f. ; Baur, *neutest. Theol.* p. 140 f. ; Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Holsten, Hofmann, Reithmayr, Matthias (who, however, assumes the intentional appearance of an ambiguity), Stölting, and others ; also Lipsius, *Rechtfertigungsl.* p. 75 ; Lechler, *apost. Zeit.* p. 110.

[2] Comp. Holsten, *z. Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 297.

[3] Some unexegetically combine *the two* explanations, as Bengel : "ut agnoscerentur et invalerescerent," "that they might be acknowledged and gain strength."

[4] So Augustine, Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Calovius, Wolf, Schoettgen, Michaelis, Windischmann, and others ; also Winer

---

("ut manifestam redderet atque ita argueret illam, quam Judaei peccando sibi contrahebant, culpam," "to render manifest and so to convict of that guilt which the Jews by sinning had contracted").

[1] Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 947, appropriately remarks : "*χάριν* cum genitivo dictum : *in gratiam* alicuius, inde *alicuius* aut *hominis* aut *rei causa* significans, quamquam minime semper *gratia* adsignificatur, quae Ammonii doctrina est, p. 53." Comp. 1 John iii. 12.

[2] So Jerome, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Grotius, Zachariae, Semler, Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Paulus, Rückert, Olshausen, Neander, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Baur, Ewald ("in order *to punish* them *more strictly*") ; also Messner, *Lehre d. Ap.* p. 222, and Hauck, comp. Buhl ; several, such as Grotius and Rückert, think that the inclination to Egyptian idolatry is chiefly referred to.

[3] Comp. also Matthies.

[4] Hofmann.

[5] Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 198.

[6] Matthiae, p. 1158.

[7] See Stallbaum, *ad Phaed.* p. 62 C ; Hermann, *de part. ἄν*, p. 110 ff. : Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 291 ff. Comp. on 1 Cor. xi. 26.

that is, *Christ*, whose advent, according to ver. 16, necessarily brought with it the fulfilment of the promise. The *dative*, however, does not stand for εἰς ὅν,[1] but just as, in ver. 16 : *to whom the promise was made.* — ἐπήγγελται] not *promiserat*, "had promised,"[2] comp. Rom. iv. 21, Heb. xii. 26; but *promissio facta est*, "the promise was made" (2 Macc. iv. 27), because thus it is not requisite to supply Θεός, and the expression corresponds very naturally with ἐῤῥέθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι in ver. 16. Hence also it is superfluous to supply ἡ κληρονομία (Ewald). — διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χ. μεσ.] the mode *in which* ὁ νόμος προσετέθη, or *the form* of this act : *having been ordained through angels*, etc. On διατάσσειν νόμον, comp. Hesiod, ἔργ. 274. The simple τάσσειν νόμον is more frequently used, as in Plat. *Legg.* p. 863 D. It means *to ordain a law*, that is, *to issue it for obedience*, not *to arrange it for publication* (Stölting), so that the angels would be described here as the *diaskeuastai*, "revisers," of the law,—an idea which has no support anywhere, and would run counter to the view of the *directly* divine origin of the law (Ex. xxxi. 18, xxxii. 16 ; Deut. ix. 10). As to the use of the aorist participle in the language of narration, see Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 774 ; Bernhardy, p. 383. The tradition that the divine promulgation of the law took place amidst the *ministry of angels*, is first found in the LXX., Deut. xxxiii. 2 (not in the original text) [See Note XLVIII., p. 160] ; then in Heb. ii. 2, Acts vii. 38, 53, Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 5. 3, and in the Rabbins, and also in the Samaritan theology.[3] Because the tradition itself and its antiquity are thus beyond doubt, and there is no warrant for supposing that Paul did not know it or was not likely to adopt it (as, indeed, he adopted other traditional teachings, 1 Cor. x. 4, 2 Cor. xii. 2), it is a mere mistaken evasion to explain διά as *inter*, "among," or *coram*, "in presence of,"[4] which would have ultimately to be referred to the idea "by the mediation of" (as 2 Tim. ii. 2). The same remark applies to the view which looks upon the ἀγγέλων even as *men*, like Moses and Aaron ;[5] Chrysostom left it optional to understand it either of *priests* or of *angels.* As to the monstrous amplifications which this tradition of the agency of the angels underwent at the hands of the later Rabbins, see Eisenmenger, *entdecktes Judenth.* I. p. 309 f. Paul does not look upon the angels as *authors* of the law,[6] — as is certain from the whole view taken in biblical history of the law generally as *divine*,[7] and here especially is all the more decidedly indicated by the use of the διά (and not ὑπό), for every reader in fact conceived of the angels as *ministering* spirits of God,[8] who accompanied the Lord appearing in majesty ; and consequently no one could attach any other sense to διά than "*ministerio* angelorum," "by the ministry of angels,' which is clear as the meaning in Heb. ii. 2 from διὰ τοῦ κυρίου in ver.

---

[1] Winer, Usteri.

[2] Vulgate, Bengel, Flatt, Hofmann.

[3] Comp. on Acts vii. 53 ; Delitzsch, on *Hebr.* ii. 2.

[4] Calovius, Loesner, Morus.

[5] Zeger, and revived by Cassel, *d. Mittler e. exeg. Versuch*, 1855.

[6] As held by Schulthess, Voigtländer in Keil and Tzschirner's *Anal.* IV. p. 139 ff., and Huth, *Commentat.* Altenb. 1854.

[7] See the apostle's own designation of the law as νόμος Θεοῦ, Rom. vii. 22, 25, and as γραφή, vers. 10, 13, iv. 21 f., *et al.*

[8] Comp. LXX. Deut. xxxiii. 2 : ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ, "from his right hand the angels with him."

3. — *ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου*[1]] For Moses received the tables of the law from God, and carried them down to the people. Thus in the legislation he was the middle person between the *Giver* of the law and its *recipients ; with the tables in his hand*, he was God's envoy to Israel, acting between the two parties. On account of this historical circumstance (Ex. xxxi. 18, xxxii. 15), *ἐν χειρί* is to be understood not merely as a vivid mode of designating the mediation (בְּיַד), but quite literally.[2] In the N. T. the designation of Moses as *μεσίτης* forms the basis of the expression in Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24 ; and on the subject itself, comp. Acts vii. 38. This designation does not occur in the O. T. or in the Apocrypha ; but by the Rabbins Moses is called *mediator* סרסור, אמצעי, also שליח.[3] The better known and the more celebrated *Moses* was as mediator of the law,[4] the more decidedly must we reject every interpretation in which the *μεσίτης*—not more precisely defined by Paul, but presumed to have its historical reference universally familiar — is *not* referred to Moses. This applies not only to the view of most of the Fathers,[5] who, following 1 Tim. ii. 5, Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24, take the Mediator to be *Christ*,[6] but also to Schmieder's view,[7] that an *angel* is intended—the *angel of the law*, who, according to Jewish theology, had the special duty of teaching Moses the law. Certainly the Rabbins speak of an angel of the law ;[8] but this part of their teaching cannot be shown to have existed in the time of the apostles, nor can it find a biblical basis in the passages quoted by Schmieder (Ex. xix. 19 f., xx. 18, xxxiii. 11 ; Num. xii. 5–8 ; Deut. v. 4 f. ; also Ex. xxxiii. 18–23, xl. 35 ; Deut. xxxiii. 2 ; Ps. lxviii. 18 ; Acts vii. 53 ; Mal. iii. 1). See also, in opposition to Schmieder,[9] especially Lücke in the *Stud. u. Krit.* p. 97 f. — *The object for which Paul has added διαταγεὶς . . . μεσίτου*, is not to convey the impression of *an inferior*, *subordinate* position held by the law in comparison with that of the gospel or that of the promise, inasmuch as the former was ordained not directly by God, but through angels and a mediator.[10] [See Note XLIX., p. 161.] (Luther, Elsner, Wolf,

---

[1] *μεσίτης* is a word that belongs to the later Greek (Polyb., Lucian, *et al.*). Comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 121. It occurs in the LXX. only in Job ix. 33.

[2] Comp. Ex. xxxii. 15 ; Lev. xxvi. 46.

[3] See Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 738 f. ; Wetstein, p. 224. Comp. Philo, *de vita Mos.* II. p. 678 f. A ; and on the matter itself, Deut. v. 5 ; also Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 5. 3.

[4] Comp. *Aboth R. Nath.* i. 1, "Legem, quam Deus Israelitis dedit, non nisi *per manus Mosis* dedit," "the land which God gave to the Israelites only by the hands of Moses."

[5] Origen, Athanasius, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact ; so also Beza, Lyra, Erasmus, Calvin, Pareus, Calovius, and others.

[6] So also very recently Culmann, *zum Verständn. der Worte Gal.* iii. 20, Strassb. 1864.

[7] *Nova interpr. Gal.* iii. 19, 20, Numburg. 1826.

[8] He was called *Jefifia ;* see *Jalkut Rubeni*, f. 107. 3.

[9] With whom Schneckenburger agrees. See on ver. 20.

[10] Luther, 1538 : "Lex est *servorum* vox, evangelium *Domini*," "The law is the word of servants ; the gospel, that of the Lord." Hofmann : Paul gives his readers to understand *that the event of the giving of the law was no fulfilment of the promise* (see, however, on ver. 20). Bengel : God committed the law to angels, "*quasi alienius quiddam et severius*," "as though more remote and severe." Buhl confines himself to saying that Paul wished to represent the *difference* between the mode of revelation in the case of the law and that of the covenant of promise. But the question regarding the purpose of this representation as bearing on the apostle's argument thus remains unanswered. According to Hilgen-

Estius, Semler, Rosenmüller, Tychsen, Flatt, Rückert, Usteri, de Wette, Baur, Ewald, Hofmann, Reithmayr, Hauck, and others; comp. also Olshausen, and Lipsius, *Rechtfertigungsl.* p. 77; Vogel in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, p. 530), but its object is to enable the reader to realize the *glory* of the law in the dignity and formal solemnity of its ordination.[1] It may be decisively urged in favor of the latter view, (1) that, if the mention of the angels was intended to suggest a lower relation in comparison with a higher, this higher relation must have been distinctly expressed (as in Heb. ii. 2), or at least must have been quite definitely discoverable from the immediate context (by the addition of a *μόνον* perhaps, or the like). Regarded in themselves, the appearance of angels and the agency of angels (comp. also i. 8) are always conceived as something majestic and glorifying,[2] even in respect to *Christ*,[3] and especially in respect to the law,[4] the bestowal of which was one of the high divine distinctions of Israel.[5] Just as little can it be said (2) that *ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου* is a depreciatory statement, for in fact the gospel also is given *ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου*; to which argument the objection cannot be made, that the Mediator of the gospel, as the Son of God, is far more exalted than the mediator of the law: for *ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου* does not state at all *what kind of* mediator it was who intervened in the promulgation of the law, but leaves the dignity or lowliness of his person entirely out of view, and asserts only *that* a mediator was employed in the giving of the law; so that in respect of this relation regarded by itself there was no qualitative difference between the law and the gospel: *both* were *mediated*, given through *the hand of a mediator.* By way of comparison and contrast with the gospel, *ἐν χειρὶ ἀνθρώπου* or some such expression must have been used, whereby the mediation of the law would be characterized as *inferior* to that of the gospel. Lastly, (3) it by no means formed a part of the plan and object of the apostle to depreciate the law as a less divine institution,—a course which, besides being inconsistent with his recognition of the law elsewhere,[6] would have been even unwise in dealing with zealots for the law; whereas it was in the highest degree appropriate to acknowledge the high dignity of the law as evinced in the majesty and solemn formality of its promulgation, and then to show that it had by no means cancelled the promises. Thus the glory of the law glorified the covenant of promise, while the apostle's opponents could not find any antagonism to that law. In opposition to these arguments, the appeal to *ὁ Θεός*, ver. 20,[7] has the less weight, because in *προσετέθη* and *διαταγείς* (ver. 19) God in fact is obviously the acting subject, and the *promise* also was expressed *passively* by *ἐπήγγελται* (without *Θεός*). According to Holsten, *z. Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 299 ff., Paul intends to express "the pneumatic truth,"

---

feld, Paul's intention was to detach as far as possible the origin of the law from the supreme God; and in this respect also he was the precursor of Gnosticism.

[1] So Calvin and others, including Winer, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, Wieseler, Matthias; comp. Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 284.

[2] Hence we must not say with Schmid, *bibl. Theol.* II. p. 280, that the intention was to intimate that the giving of the law was *not* "*the absolute normal act*" of the divine economy.

[3] Matt. xxiv. 31, xxv. 31; John i. 52; 1 Tim iii. 16, *et al.*

[4] LXX. Deut. xxxiii. 2; Acts vii. 38, 53.

[5] Rom. ix. 4.

[6] Rom. vii. 12-25.

[7] Usteri, Schneckenburger, de Wette.

that, in the purpose of God, the significance of the law in the economy of salvation was to be that of a mediator, viz., between promise and fulfilment. But if this were so, how wonderfully would Paul have concealed his thoughts! He must have *said* that this mediatorial position of the law *exhibited itself* in the form of its bestowal; for this in itself, and apart from any other intimation, could in no way be known to the reader, to whom angelic and mediatorial agency presented themselves only as historically familiar attributes of the majesty and divinity of the law. The law *itself* would not be placed by these attributes in the category of the μεσίτης. Nor is Stölting's view more worthy of acceptance, who, in διαταγ. δι' ἀγγέλων, detects the idea: "*in order that the Jews might obtain the blessing of Abraham*" (Heb. i. 14), and explains ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου to mean that the law served as an instrument to the mediator for *reconciling discordant parties* with one another (and these parties are alleged to have been the *Jews* and *Gentiles*). These two ideas, which are only in a very indirect way compatible with the scope of the Pauline teaching as to the relation of the law to the gospel, or with history itself, could not have been found out by the readers, especially after ver. 18, and after τῶν παραβάσ. χάριν, and would have needed a more precise explanation *in what reference* they were to be taken. In unison with the *history* of the giving of the law, which was familar to every reader, the two points could only be understood as reminiscences of the historical circumstances in question; and μεσίτης in particular could not be conceived as a *reconciling* mediator, but only in the sense conveyed in Acts vii. 38.

Ver. 20 down to μὴ γένοιτο, ver. 21. "*But from the fact that the law was ordained through a mediator, it must not at all be concluded that it is opposed to the promises of God.*" The expression just used, ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου, might possibly be turned to the advantage of the law and to the prejudice of the promises, *in this way*, that it might be said: "Since the idea of a mediator supposes not *one* subject, to whom his business relates, but *more than one*, who have to be mutually dealt with, and yet God (who gave the law through a mediator) is *one*, so that there could not be one God who gave the law and another who gave the promises (for there are not more Gods than one); it might possibly be concluded that, because the law was ordained by God in a different way from the promises,—namely, by the calling in of a mediator acting between the two parties,—the earlier divine mode of justification (that of faith) opened up in the promises was abolished by the law, and instead of it, another and opposite mode of justification (that of the works of the law) was opened up by God." Paul conceives the possibility of this inference, and therefore brings it forward, not, however, as an objection on the part of opponents, but as his own reflection; hence he expresses the concluding inference, ὁ οὖν νόμος κ.τ.λ., in an interrogative form, to which he thereupon replies by the disclaimer, μὴ γένοιτο. The *explanation* of the words, which in themselves are simple enough, is accordingly as follows: "*But the mediator*—not to leave unnoticed an inference which might possibly be drawn to the prejudice of the promises from the ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου just said—*but the mediator*, that is, any mediator, *does not belong to a single person*, but intervenes between two or more; *God, on the other hand, is a single per-*

son, and not a plurality. *Is it now*—when these two propositions are applied *in concreto* to the law and the promises—*is it now to be thence inferred that the law*, which was given through a mediator, and in which therefore there took part more subjects than one, in point of fact two (namely, God and Israel), between whom the mediator had to deal, *is opposed to the divine promises*, in which the same one God, who in the case of the law acted through a mediator and so implied two parties, acted directly ? God forbid ! From this point of difference in the divine bestowal of the law and the promises, by no means is any such conclusion to be arrived at to the prejudice of the latter, as if now, through the law mediatorially given by the one God, another divine mode of justification were to be made valid." In this view, ver. 20 contains two *loci communes*, from the mutual relation of which in reference to the two *concreta* under discussion (the law and the promises) in ver. 21 a possible inference is supposed to be drawn, and proposed by way of question for a reply. The *δέ* is in both cases adversative : the first introducing a supposed objection, and the second an incidental point belonging to this objection, the relation of which incidental point to the first proposition strengthens the doubt excited ; *ὁ μεσίτης* denotes the mediator absolutely as *genus* ("quae multa sunt cunctis in unum colligendis," Hermann, *ad Iph. Aul.* p. 15, pref.) : *ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν* is predicate, negativing the *ἑνὸς εἶναι* as regards the mediator, with emphatic stress laid on the prefixed *ἑνός* (not on the *οὐκ*, as Hofmann thinks), and *ἑνός* is *masculine*,[1] without requiring anything to be supplied : *εἷς ἐστιν* is predicate, and *εἷς*, in conformity with the axiom of monotheism here expressed, is used quite in the same purely *numerical* sense as *ἑνός* previously. Lastly, in the interrogative inference, ver. 21, *ὁ νόμος* is used, as the close annexation by *οὖν* sufficiently indicates, in precise correlation to *ὁ μεσίτης* in ver. 20 (for the law was given through a *mediator*, ver. 19), and *τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ* to *ᾧ ἐπήγγελται*, ver. 19 ; but the emphasis in this question of ver. 21 is laid upon *κατά*, for Paul will not allow it to be inferred from the two propositions expressed in ver. 20 (*μὴ γένοιτο*), that the law stood in a relation to the promises which was *antagonistic* to them and opposed to their further validity as regards justification. — The numerous *different interpretations* of this passage—and it has had to undergo above 250 of them—have specially multiplied in modern times : for the Fathers of the Church pass but lightly over the words which in themselves are clear, without taking into consideration their difficulties in relation to the general scope of the passage,—mostly applying the *ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν*, taken correctly and generally, to Christ,[2] who is the Mediator between God and man, and partly casting side-glances at the opponents of Christ's divinity ;[1] although a *diversity* of interpretation (some referring μεσίτης to *Moses*, and others to Christ) is expressly mentioned by Oecumenius. Although no special dogmatic interest attached to the passage, nevertheless in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (see Poole's *Synopsis*) the variety of interpretations was already such that almost every interpreter of importance (yet, as a rule, without polemical controversy, because the dogmatic element did not come into play) took a way of his own. It became, however, still greater after the middle of the eighteenth century (especially after grammatico-historical exegesis gained ground, but with an abundant intermixture of its philological aberrations), and is even now continually increasing. How often have the most mistaken fancies and the crudest conjectures sought to gain acceptance in connection with our passage, the explanation of which was regarded as a feat of exegetical skill ![2] It is enough that out of the multitude of various interpretations—omitting the criticism in detail of the earlier views down to Keil[3]—we specify the more

---

[1] Not *neuter*, as Holsten takes it, although ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν which follows can only indicate the *masculine*. Holsten, not withstanding all his subtle acuteness, errs also in making the law itself, in opposition to the tenor of the words, to be the μεσίτης (see on ver. 19), and in explaining the predicate εἷς attached to ὁ Θεός in the sense of the *immutability* of the divine *will ;* holding that the law stands, not in unity with the promise, but between the two component parts of the latter (the giving of the promise and its fulfilment), and that God's *one* saving will reveals itself in the promise and its two parts. See, in opposition to Holsten, Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 230 ff.

[2] Jerome, however, explains the passage as referring to *the two natures* of Christ : "manu mediatoris potentiam et virtutem

---

ejus debemus accipere, qui cum secundum : Deum unum sit ipse cum Patre (ὁ δὲ Θεός, *as God*), secundum mediatoris officium (ὁ δὲ μεσίτης) alius ab eo intelligitur," "By the hand of a Mediator we ought to understand the power and virtue of Him who according to God is understood as one with the Father, but in His office of mediator is understood as other than Him" (ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν) ! Theodoret understands ὁ δὲ μεσίτης definitely of *Moses*, who intervened between God and the people (ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν), but holds that ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν affirms that it is one and the same God who first gave the promises to Abraham, then gave the law, and now has shown the goal (τὸ πέρας) of the promises. Μεσίτης is explained as referring to *Moses* by Gennadius in Oecumenius (p. 742 C); on the other hand, Chrysostom and Theophylact take as a basis the conclusion, ὥστε καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς δύο τινῶν ἐστι μεσίτης, Θεοῦ δηλαδὴ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, "so that Christ is Mediator of two, manifestly of God and men" (Theophylact).—Among modern Catholic expositors, Windischmann and Bisping have closely followed Jerome in the reference of the second half of the verse to the *two natures of Christ*. The meaning is supposed to amount to this, that the promise was directly addressed from God to God (*i.e.*,to Christ), and the passage is thus a *locus classicus in favor of the divinity of Christ*. Not so Reithmayr, who in substance follows the interpretation of Theodoret.

[1] See Chrysostom.

[2] For a general view of the mass of interpretations, the following works are of service :—Koppe, *Exc.* VII. p. 128 ff. ed. 3 : Bonitz, *Plurimor. de l. Gal.* iii. 20 *sententiae examinatae novaque ejus interpr. tentata*, Lips. 1800 ; also his *Spicileg. observatt. ad Gal.* iii. 20, Lips. 1802 : Anton, *Diss. l. Gal.* iii. 20 *critice, historice, et exeg. tract.* in Pott's *Sylloge*, V. p. 141 ff. : Keil (seven programmes), in his *Opusc.* I. p. 211 ff. : Winer, *Exc.* III. : Schott, p. 455 ff. : Wieseler, and de Wette ed. Möller, *in loc.*

[3] Luther, 1519 : "Ex nomine mediatoris concludit, nos adeo esse peccatores, ut legis opera satis esse nequeant. Si, inquit, lege justi estis, jam mediatore non egetis, sed neque Deus, cum sit ipse unus, secum optime conveniens. Inter duos ergo quaeritur mediator, inter Deum et hominem, ac si dicat ; impiissima sit ingratitudo si mediatorem rejicitis, et Deo, qui unus est, remittitis," etc., "From the name of Mediator he concludes that we are sinners in such way as to be unable to fulfil the works of the law. If, said he, ye are just by the law, ye do not need now a Mediator, and God, since He is one, is not self-consistent. A Mediator, therefore, is required between two, viz., between God and man, as though he were to say : Most godless would be your ingratitude if you reject a mediator, and to God, who is one, you remit," etc. Erasmus in his *Paraphr.*, understanding Christ as referred to (in the *Annotat.* he says nothing at all about the passage) : "Atqui conciliator, et si intercedit, inter plures intercedat oportet ; nemo enim secum ipse dissidet. Deus autem unus est, quocum dissidium erat humano generi. Proinde tertio quopiam erat opus, qui naturae utriusque particeps utramque inter sese reconciliaret Deum placans sua morte, et homines sua

recent literature, and adduce the following: 1. Keil, who comes nearest to our view, explains thus (see *Opusc.* I. p. 365 ff.): "*Meditatorem quidem non unius sed duarum certe partium esse, Deum autem, qui Abrahamo beneficii* doctrina ad verum Dei cultum pelliciens," "But the conciliator, who intercedes, must intercede among a number; for no one disagrees with himself. God, however, with whom there was disagreement as respected the human race, is one. Hence there was need of a third participant of both natures to reconcile both with one another, appeasing God by his death, and alluring men by his doctrine to the true worship of God." Calvin also, explaining the passage of Christ, considers: "diversitatem hic notari inter Judaeos et gentiles. Non unius ergo mediator est Christus, quia diversa est conditio eorum, quibuscum Deus, ipsius auspiciis, paciscitur, quod ad externam personam. Verum P. inde aestimandum Dei foedus negat, quasi secum pugnet aut varium sit pro hominum diversitate," "Here the diversity between Jews and Gentiles is noted. Christ, therefore, is not a mediator of one, because diverse is the condition of those with whom God, by His tokens, makes a covenant as to the outward person. But Paul denies that God's covenant is to be thence estimated as though it were inconsistent or various in accordance with the diversity of men." Castalio gives the sense of the words correctly: "Sequester autem internuntius est duorum, qui inter sese aliquid paciscuntur: atqui Deus unus est, non duo," "A mediator is a messenger between two who make some covenant with one another: but God is one, not two;" but then draws therefrom the strange inference: "itaque necesse est Mosen Dei et Israelitarum internuntium fuisse, nec enim potest Dei et Dei internuntius fuisse, cum duo Dei non sint," "It was necessary, therefore, for Moses to be a mediator between God and the Israelites; for he could not have been a mediator between God and God, since there are not two gods;" and from this again he infers that both parties had thus promised something, God promising life and the Israelites obedience; and lastly, with equal arbitrariness: "nunc quoniam legi parere nequeunt, supplicio sunt obnoxii," "Since, now, they cannot obey the law, they are subject to punishment." Grotius (comp. Beza): "Non solet sequester se interponere inter eos, qui unum sunt (ἐνός, neuter), i.e. bene conveniunt; Deus sibi constat," "A mediator is not accustomed to interpose between those who are one (ἐνος, neuter gender), *i.e.*, those who well agree. God is self-consistent;" from which he arbitrarily infers: "quare nisi homines se mutassent, nunquam opus fuisset mediatore neque tum neque nunc," "Wherefore, unless men had changed, there would never have been need of a mediator, whether then or now." Comp. Schoettgen, who, however, assumes the first part of the verse to be an objection on the part of the Jews, and ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν to be Paul's reply. Wolf, although referring μεσίτου in ver. 19 to Moses, yet in ver. 20 understands μεσίτης of *Christ*: "Ille vero mediator (qui imprimis hic respiciendus est) unius non est (sed duorum), quorum unus est Deus," "But that mediator who must here be especially regarded is not of one, but of two, one of whom is God." Clarke, who understands μεσίτ. in ver. 19 as referring to Christ: "Quilibet vero μεσίτης est duarum partium. Deus est una pars. Ergo quorum erit Christus mediator nisi Dei et hominum?" "But every mediator is of two parts. God is one part. Of whom, therefore, will Christ be mediator, unless of God and men?" Bengel discovers the syllogism: Unus non utitur mediatore illo (i.e., quisquis est unus, is non prius sine mediatore, deinde idem per mediatorem agit); atqui Deus est unus (non est alius Deus ante legem, alius deinceps, sed unus idemque Deus); ergo mediator Sinaiticus non est Dei sed legis, Dei autem promissio," "One does not use that mediator (*i.e.*, whoever is one, does not act first without a mediator, and then do the same through a mediator); but God is one (there is not one God before the law, and another after the law, but God is one and the same); the Sinaitic mediator, therefore, is not of God, but of the law, while the promise is of God." Wetstein: "Sicut quando arbitrum vel medium vel sequestrum dicimus, intelligimus ad officium ejus pertinere, ut non uni tantum partium faveat, sed utrique sese aequum praebeat; ita etiam quando Deum dicimus, intelligimus non Judaorum solum, sed omnium hominum patrem. Unde statim colligitur, Mosen, qui inter Judaeos solum et Deum medius fuit, non veri nominis medium fuisse, sed a bonitate Dei expectari debere alium, totius humani generis negotium gerentem, i.e. Christum," "As when we speak of an arbiter or medium or mediator, we understand that it pertains to his office to favor not only one of the parties, but to *aliquid promiserit, unum modo fuisse ; hincque apostolum id a lectoribus suis colligi voluisse, in lege ista Mos. pactum mutuum Deum inter atque populum Israelit. mediatoris opera intercedente initum fuisse, contra vero in promissione rem ab unius tantum (Dei sc., qui solus eam dederit) voluntate pendentem transactam, hincque legi isti nihil plane cum hac rei fuisse, adeoque nec potuisse ea novam illius promissionis implendae conditionem constitui, eoque ipso promissionem hanc omnino tolli*," "That a mediator indeed is not of one, but certainly of two parties, but that God, who had promised some benefit to Abraham, was only one ; hence that the apostle wished it to be inferred by his readers that in the law of Moses a mutual agreement had been made between God and the Israelitish people by the intervention of a mediator ; but, on the other hand, that what is comprised in the promise is dependent upon the will of only one (viz., of God, who alone has given it), and hence that the law and the contents of the promise are entirely different, and, accordingly the new condition of the fulfilment of this promise, could not be fixed, and by this very means the promise be altogether withdrawn." But (*a*) to take the second half of the verse not generally, like the first, but historically, as if ἦν was written, is an arbitrary deviation from the parallelism ; and (*b*) the conclusion professedly to be drawn by the reader, *hincque legi isti nihil*, "hence that law," etc., is quite without warrant, for *Paul himself* puts as a question in ver. 21 the inference which he conceives may be possibly drawn from ver. 20. 2. Schleiermacher's explanation is essentially sim-

---

show himself just to both ; so also when we speak of God, we understand the Father not alone of the Jews, but of all men. From this the inference is immediate that Moses, who was mediator between the Jews only and God, was not one of true name, but that from the goodness of God another ought to be expected to act for the entire human race, *i.e.*, Christ." Michaelis (following Locke) : "But this law cannot, in respect to the Gentiles, alter anything in the former covenant of God For one of the parties who had a share in this covenant, namely, the Gentiles, had not empowered Moses as a mediator and knew nothing of him ; but God Himself is only one party, and cannot alter His covenant through a mediator appointed on one side only." Nösselt (*Exercitatt. ad s. s. interpr.* p. 143 ff.) and Rosenmüller : "*Ille autem* (Moses nempe) *mediator illius unius* (prolis Abrahamicae, *the Christians!*) *non est*, *Deus autem est unus* (communis omnium) *Deus*." "But he" (viz. Moses) "is not the mediator of that one" (viz., the offspring of Abraham) "but God is one" (i.e. common to all)." Morus, interpreting it as a syllogism with an *interrogative* major : "*Hic vero* (Moses) *nonne est mediator ejus, qui immutabilis est? Subsumtio : atqui vero Deus est immutabilis. Conclusio ; num ergo lex adversari potest*, etc.?" "But is not this one" (Moses) "the mediator of him who is immutable? Minor premise : But God is immutable. Conclusion : Can the law then be against," etc. Gabler (*Prolus. ad Gal.* iii. 20, 1787) has the same alteration in the sense of εἷς : "*He* (Moses) *was not, however, a mediator of something immutable*," etc. Koppe : "*Jam quidem non* νόμῳ *Mosis tantum suus est* μεσίτης (*plures fuerunt, imprimisque* ὁ μεσίτης τῆς καιν. διαθήκης *Jesus*) *sed unus tamen idemque Deus est, qui misit omnes, is adeo debet sibi constare nec potest secum ipse pugnare*," "It is true indeed that by the law of Moses he is not alone its mediator (there were a number, and especially Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant), but, nevertheless, He is one and the same God, who sent all, and therefore He ought to be self-consistent, and cannot conflict with Himself." So also, in substance, Baumgarten-Crusius : ἑνός means *for one matter ;* and the sense is, "that the law has been one of the many divine institutions, but as such it must stand in connection with the general plan of the divine government."—Some of these interpretations condemn themselves, and others find their refutation in our examination of the more modern interpretations after Keil.

ilar (in Usteri, *Lehrbegr.* p. 186 ff.) : "*The mediator of an agreement does not exist where there is only one person, but always presupposes two persons; these were God and the Jewish nation. But God is One in reference to His promises; that is, God therein acts quite freely, unconditionally, independently, and for Himself alone, as One numerically, because it is no agreement between two, but His free gift* (*χάρις*). *Does the law therefore conflict*, etc. ?"[1] But in this view (*a*) the application of ver. 20 to the *concreta*, "concretes," of the law and the promises, which is in fact not made until ver. 21, is imported into and anticipated in ver. 20. Moreover, (*b*) *εἷς* imperceptibly changes from its numerical sense into the idea of aloneness and independence; and (*c*) the idea of free grace is arbitrarily introduced, and is not expressed by Paul. Nearest to this interpretation of Schleiermacher and Usteri comes Hilgenfeld, whose interpretation,[2] accompanied essentially by the same difficulties, ultimately amounts to the non-Pauline idea, that the position of God as a party in regard to the law is not in harmony with the divine unity (that is, with the divine monarchy). Comp. also Lipsius, *Rechtfertigungsl.* p. 77, according to whom Paul negatively "strikes the law to the ground as incompatible with the sole agency of God." But how could Paul desire to strike to the ground the law, which to him was *ἅγιος*, *ἀγαθός*, "holy, good," and *πνευματικός*, "spiritual" (Rom. vii. 12, 14) ? No, all he desires to show is, that, notwithstanding the diversity of its divine bestowal from the mode of giving the promise, it is not opposed to the promise. 3. Winer : "*Non potest μεσίτης cogitari aut fingi, qui sit ἑνός, unius h. e. unius partis : ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστι, Deus et unus, una* (*altera*) *tantummodo pars ; ita quaenam est altera? gens Israel. Jam si hoc, sponte efficitur, legem Mos. pertinere etiam ad Judaeos, hosque legi isti observandae adstrictos fuisse,*" "A mediator cannot be conceived of or imagined who is of one, *i.e.*, of one part ; 'but God is one,' one (other) part only. What then is the other ? The Israelitish nation. If now this is so, it spontaneously results that the law of Moses pertains also to the Jews, and they are bound to observe this law."[3] Thus ver. 20 contains only a parenthetical idea, Paul having in view to re-establish the dignity of the law, which appeared weakened by τῶν παραβ. χάριν προσετέθη : *Lex Mos. data fuit peccatorum gratia ; propterea vero non est, quod quis eam tanquam ista* ἐπαγγελίᾳ *longe inferiorem contemnat ; data enim et ipsa est auctoritate divina,* "The law of Moses was given on account of sins ; but from this the inference is not just that one may despise it as far inferior to the promise ; for it was given by divine authority."—διαταγ. δι' ἀγγέλων—*gentique Hebr. tanquam agendi norma proposita* ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτ. ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν ἑνός, "As a noun of action it was set forth to the Hebrew nation." It cannot be urged against Winer, that Paul must necessarily have written ὁ εἷς.[1] But (*a*) in the logically exact chain of argument there is no indication at all that ver. 20 is to be taken as a parenthesis. (*b*) Since ὁ μεσίτης is *subject*, ὁ Θεός, which likewise is placed at the beginning of the sentence, may not be arbitrarily understood as *predicate.* (*c*) It must have been more precisely indicated by Paul, if it were intended that the first ἐστίν should be understood as the copula of a general judgment, and the second as historical (*appears in the giving of the law*) ; for every reader, if he had understood the first half of the verse as a general judgment, would naturally understand the second in like manner. (*d*) It would not occur to any reader to refer εἷς

---

[1] In essential points, Usteri (*Kommentar*, p. 121 ; comp. with *Beilage*, p. 239) agrees with Schleiermacher in his explanation. Moreover, the substance of Schleiermacher's interpretation is already to be found in Zachariae, who paraphrases as follows : "A mediator presupposes two parties who make some promise to each other, inasmuch as a promise made on one side without a counter promise does not need any mediation between two. But in the case of Abraham God alone promises, who grants him a promise out of free grace."

[2] In his *Commentary.* He takes another view in his *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 236 ff. : "Paul wished to express that the covenant of the law, being ordained through angels and a mediator, and consequently through a plurality, shows itself thereby to be entirely *different* from the covenant of promise which was given by the divine unity, and consequently cannot cancel the latter." But this cancelling might certainly have been inferred from the very difference ; besides, the plurality, which is supposed to be implied in *ἑνὸς οὐκ ἐστίν*, would have nothing at all to do with the angels, but would necessarily refer only to the mediator, who has to mediate between two—in this case, between God and the Israelites.

[3] In the explanation of the words Kern (in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1830, 3) agrees with Winer, only he does not insert *tantummodo*, "only," in the second clause. He looks upon the words as an opponent's objection,

---

and in ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν he finds the idea intimated, that God in consequence took it upon Himself to bless those who obey the law ; whence the question follows : Does therefore the law, by which God has bound Himself to make blessed on account of works, conflict with the promises of God? But against this view it may be urged that there is absolutely nothing to indicate ver. 20 as the language of an opponent ; further, that the points brought forward against Winer, under (*b*), (*c*), and (*d*), equally apply here ; and lastly, that the idea found in ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν is not suggested by the context, but arbitrarily introduced. Baur also, *Paulus*, II. p. 215 f. ed. 2 (comp. his *neutest. Theol.* p. 157), agrees with Winer in his conception of the words : the mediator belongs not to one, but to two parties, but God is only the one of the two parties. By this Paul is supposed to intimate, that the law has a merely subordinate significance, just as that of the mediator, insomuch as he is not himself one of the two parties, is merely subordinate : "*the* ἐπαγγελία, "promise," *as a* διαθήκη, "covenant," *in which God* εἶς ἐστι, "is one," *without a* εσίτης *having anything to do with it, stands higher than the* νόμος, "law," *which cannot be conceived without the* μεσίτης, "mediator," *and is essentially conditioned by him.*" But in this interpretation Paul would *not* have said what he *meant* to say, and would have *said* what he did *not* mean. The view of Holsten (*Deutung u. Bedeut. d. Worte Gal.* iii. 20, Rostock 1853, and *Inhalt u. Gedankengang des Gal. Br.* 1859, pp. 39 ff., 63 ff.) is allied to the explanation of Baur. Holsten understands μεσίτης, "mediator," as referring to the law, and makes ἑνός neuter : Between the law and the promise the relation is not that of an ἕν, but of an essential distinction : but God is at one with Himself, not presenting any difference with Himself, namely, in the sense of the immutability of the divine will. This explanation cannot be accepted, because it starts from the supposition that the law is placed under the category of the μεσίτης, "mediator." Paul cannot have so conceived it, because he has said that the law was *ordained* through a μεσίτης, "mediator ;" therefore law and mediator must have been present to his mind as *different ideas.*—Steinfass (in Guericke's *Zeitschr.* 1856, p. 237) understands the literal sense definitely and correctly, but from the words ὁ δὲ Θε ὀςεἶς ἐστιν, "but God is one," derives the tacit idea : God therefore is not the other party, and consequently is not under the law—by which the freedom of *Christ* as the Son of God from the law is supposed to be proved. But this is an idea foreign to the context and imported into the passage, not even quite Pauline ; for submission to the law certainly formed a part of the state of humiliation of the Son of God (Gal. iv. 4), while as to the state of exaltation His elevation above the law is a matter of course.

[1] See Winer, *Gramm.* p. 110.

to a suppressed ὁ ἕτερος : for ἑνός had just been used absolutely in a numerical sense, in which therefore εἷς at once presents itself ; and this the more, because the first sentence, by its negative form, has prepared the way for an antithesis to follow. (*e*) The idea which ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν is supposed to indicate : *therefore the law is obligatory on the Israelites*, conveys something which is so entirely a matter of course, that it could not be made use of at all as an element of the *dignity* of the law ; for the law was, in fact, *given* to the Israelites, and even to *think* of that obligation as non-existent would have been incongruous. And (*f*) even assuming such a superfluous idea, in what a strangely mysterious way would Paul have intimated it ! That which he meant to *say*, he would wholly without reason have *concealed*, and have given out as it were a riddle. Apart from the unsuitableness of the idea generally, and from the inappropriate εἷς, he must have said : ὁ δὲ Ἰσραὴλ εἷς ἐστιν, "but Israel is one." 4. Schulthess has sought to vindicate his interpretation,[1] viz. : "*Hic mediator* (*Moses*) *non est mediator unius, i.e., communis illius Dei, qui olim Abrahamo spopondit, per eum aliquando gentes beatum iri, et qui est unus, s. communis omnium parens, sed est potius mediator angelorum*," "This mediator (Moses) is not a mediator of one, *i.e.*, common to that God who once promised Abraham that through Him at some time the nations would be blessed, and who is one, or the common parent of all, but is rather the mediator of angels."[2] But (*a*) how erroneous it is to assume that the anarthrous ἑνός should denote the universal God of men, and how alien this reference is to the context ! (*b*) How opposed is the δι’ ἀγγέλων to the notion, that Moses was "mediator *angelorum*" *!* (*c*) How at variance is the idea of the law as the work *of angels* with the conception throughout the Bible (comp. on ver. 19) of the law as the work *of God !* In how wholly different a way must Paul have spoken of and *proved* such a paradox, and how *frequently* would he have reverted to it (especially in the Epistle to the Romans) in his antinomistic discussions ! 5. Akin to this, as far as the idea is concerned, is the interpretation of Schmieder (*Nova interpr. l. Paul Gal.* iii. 19 f., Numb. 1826, and in Tholuck's *literar. Anz.* 1830, No. 54) : "*Quivis minister vel multorum est vel unius : atqui mediator non est unius : ergo est multorum minister. Qui multorum est minister, ad quod genus mediator pertinet, non est unius : atqui Deus* (*absolute*) *unus est : ergo cum multorum sit mediator, non est Dei minister,*" "Every minister is either of many or of one ; but a mediator is not of one : therefore he is a minister of many. He who is a minister (to which class a mediator belongs) of many, is not of one ; but God is absolutely one : since, therefore, he is a minister of many, he is not a minister of God." The connection is supposed to be : "*Concedo legem per angelos datam esse a Deo, non humana arte inventam, sed eo ipso, quod per angelos ministros, non per Deum aut Dei filium promulgata est, inferior est evangelio,*" "I grant that the law was given by God through angels, and not devised by human art, but from the very fact that it was published through angels as ministers and not through God or the Son of God, it is inferior to the gospel."[1] This interpretation is objectionable, (*a*) in a general point of view, because it rests wholly on the erroneous view that μεσίτου in ver. 19 applies not to Moses, but to the *angelus mediator*, "angel mediator ;" (*b*) because Paul could not have expressed so peculiar an antinomistic argument more obscurely or more enigmatically than by thus *omitting* the essential points ; (*c*) because the idea of μεσίτης by no means implies that the μεσίτης is the "minister *multorum* :" he may be commissioned as well by one as by many, as, in fact, Christ was commissioned as a μεσίτης by One, viz., by God.[2] 6. Steudel, in Bengel's *Archiv.* I. p. 124 ff., supposes that ver. 19 is an opponent's question : "*To what purpose then serves the law ? Was it bestowed merely somehow as an additional gift on*

---

[1] Proposed in Keil and Tzschirner's *Anal.* II. 3, p. 133 ff. in his *Engelwelt, Engelgesetz und Engeldienst*, Zürich 1833, and in *de G. Hermanno, enodatore ep. P. ad Gal.*, Zürich 1835.

[2] Similar also is the interpretation of Caspari (in the *Strassb. Beitr.* 1854, p. 206 ff.), that "Moses, the middle-man of the angels who gave the law, is not the mediator of the One who gave the promise ; he is the mediator of many angels, but God is one." Vogel's explanation (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, p. 524) comes in substance to the same effect : "Where there is a mediator, there is a plurality of *those commissioning* him ; such a plurality existed in the giving of the law ; but God is one ; consequently the law proceeded from a plurality distinct from God, and *the angels* form this plurality." In opposition to Vogel, see Hilgenfeld, in his *Zeitschrift*, 1865, p. 452 ff. ; Matthias, in the monograph quoted at ver. 19, p. 30 ff. ; Hauck, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 699 ff. Nevertheless Hauck (in the *Stud. u Krit.* 1862, p. 541 ff.) has likewise assumed a plurality in μεσίτης, *mediator*—the plurality *of men*, whom *Moses* represents *as one out of the midst of them* (but μεσίτης does not mean this) ; hence he cannot be representative of the one *God*. Nothing in our passage can be regarded as more certain than that ὁ μεσίτης, applied to the act of giving the law, embraces in itself the idea : ὃν ἔδωκε κύριος, "what the Lord made" (not directly, but), ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σινᾷ ἐν χειρὶ Μωυσῆ, "between him and the children of Israel in Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses" (Lev. xxvi. 46). Buhl, *l c.* p. 13, has interpreted the passage similarly to Hauck, but with an incorrect inference from the negation of *necessity* to the negation of *possibility :* the mediator always represents a great number of persons ; but God is single, and as such does not *need* any mediator : therefore the mediator (ver. 19) *cannot* be the representative of *God*, but, on the contrary, can only accept the law for a plurality of *recipients.* Thus the law stands in contrast to the covenant of promise, which was given to the *One* σπέρμα, "seed."

---

[1] Schneckenburger's explanation (in his *Beitr.* p. 189 ff., and in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, p. 121) agrees with Schmieder's. Huth's attempt at an explanation (*Comment. de loco Gal.* iii. 19 f., Altenb., 1854) agrees partly with Schmieder and partly with Schulthess ; he understands ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου of an "*angelus* mediator," angel-mediator, and then in ver. 20 finds the idea that the law proceeds from angels, and not from God, as follows: "*Mediatore enim nihil opus fuisset, si unus tantummodo legem tulisset ; at si multitudo quaedam, qualis est angelorum, legem ferre vult tum rei summa exsequenda traditur uni, qui mediatoris vicem inter legis latores et eos gerat quibus lex destinata est. Haec autem ratio cadere non potest in Deum, quippe qui unis numero sit, ideoque mediatore non indigeat. Ex hoc ipso igitur, quod in ferenda lege Mosaica opus fuit mediatore, colligendum est, originem ejus repeti non debere ab uno Deo, sed a pluribus, h. e. ab angelis, quorum mediator vice fungebatur,*" "For there would have been no need of a mediator, if only one had borne the law ; but if a multitude, such as that of angels, wishes to bear the law, then to execute the completion of what matter pertains thereto, it is delivered to one who occupies the place of mediator between the bearers of the law and those for whom it has been destined. This method, however, cannot occur with respect to God, as being one in number and accordingly not needing a mediator. From the very fact, then, that in propounding the law of Moses, there was need of a mediator, it must be inferred that its origin should not be derived from one, viz., God, but from many, *i.e.*, from the angels, whose place the mediator fulfilled."

[2] See also, in opposition to Schmieder, Lücke in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1828, p. 95 ff. ; Winer, *Exc.* III. p. 171 ff.

account of transgressions (*in order to be transgressed*), *until the seed should come to whom the promise applied? And yet was it made known through angels, and by the ministry of a mediator?*" To which Paul answers, *Certainly through the ministry of a mediator; only he was not the mediator of an united seed* (of the σπέρματος τῶν πιστευόντων, ver. 16), *but God is one* (*not another for the Gentiles*)." But (*a*) there is nothing that indicates any such division of the passage into dialogue; and (*b*) how strange it would be that Paul should have grasped, and furnished a reply to, nothing but the *last* part of the opponent's question, ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου, which, moreover, would be only a subordinate part of it! (*c*) The article must be added to ἑνός, if it is to apply to the σπέρμα already spoken of (as assumed also by Jatho); but *no* supplement whatever to ἑνός is suggested by the context;[1] and if τοῦ ἑνὸς σπέρματος were read, then, according to ver. 16, it would mean not the body of Christians, but Christ Himself.[2] (*d*) ἑνός and εἷς would be taken in different senses: *united* and *one*.[3] 7. Sack[4] supposes that Paul avails himself of the idea of a mediator to *limit* the recognition of the law, which perhaps some Jewish Christians were disposed to assert to an exaggerated extent, and says: "*The mediator, however, is not of one kind, but God is One and the same. For us Christians there is certainly another mediator than Moses; but God, the God in both Testaments, is nevertheless One and the same.*" But it is obvious that ἑνός ἐστιν cannot mean *unius generis est*, "is of one class," and it is equally evident that the clause, "for us Christians there is certainly," etc., is arbitrarily brought in. See also Schneckenburger,[1] and (in opposition to Steudel, Kern, and Sack) Winer.[2] 8. Hermann : *Interventor non est unius* (*i.e.*, *interventor ubi est, duos minimum esse oportet, inter quos ille interveniat*) ; *Deus autem unus est : ergo apud Deum non cogitari potest interventor ; esset enim is, qui intercederet inter Deum et Deum, quod absurdum est*," "An intercessor is not of one (*i.e.*, wherever there is an intercessor, there must be at least two with whom he intercedes) ; God, however, is of one ; therefore an intercessor with God cannot be thought of ; for he would have to be one to intercede between God and God, which is absurd." And the connection is : "*Id agebat P. ut ostenderet, legem Mosis, quae nihil neque cum promissione Abrahamo data neque cum praesente effectione promissionis commune haberet, dumtaxat interim valuisse, jam autem non amplius valere. Rationem reddit hanc, quod superaddita sit* (*ideo* προσετέθη *dixit*), *eoque non pertineat ad testamentum, cui non liceat quidquam addi ; deinde quod non, sicut testamentum illud, ab ipso Deo condita et data, sed disposita per angelos allataque sit manu interventoris : atqui interventori, quod interventor non sit unius, non esse locum apud Deum, qui unus sit, utpote testator, cujus unius ex voluntate nemine intercedente haereditatem capiat haeres*," "Paul did this to show that the law of Moses, which had nothing in common with the promise given to Abraham, nor with the present effect of the promise, only had been some time valid, but was now no longer valid. He gives this reason, that it was added (he said accordingly προσετέθη), and accordingly does not pertain to the covenant, whereto nothing could be added ; then that it was not instituted by God Himself and given, as that former covenant, but ordained by angels and delivered by the hand of a mediator ; but for the intercessor, since he is not the intercessor of one, there is no place with God, who is one, seeing that He is the testator, from the will of whom alone and without the intervention of any one, the heir receives the inheritance." But (*a*) it could not be expected that the reader should derive from ver. 20 the idea that no mediator is conceivable in the case of God on account of His oneness ; nor could it be so conceived by Paul himself, for, in fact, with the one God a mediator may certainly have a place,—not, however, "*inter Deum et Deum*," "between God and God," into which absurdity no one could fall, unless Paul so expressed it, but *inter Deum et homines*, "God and men," in which office the history of the theocracy showed so many mediators and at last Christ Himself. (*b*) The question in ver. 21 (οὖν), with the answer expressive of horror, μὴ γένοιτο, presupposes that the subject-matter of this question—consequently an antagonistic relation of the law to the promises—*might possibly* (although quite unduly) *be derived from ver.* 20. But according to Hermann, Paul in vv. 19 and 20 has already proved that an antagonism of the law to the promises does *not* exist, that the law was no longer valid, and had nothing at all in common with the promises. So, in a logical point of view, the question in ver. 21, ὁ οὖν νόμος κ.τ.λ., could not be asked, nor could the answer μὴ γένοιτο be made. (*c*) It may, besides, be urged against Hermann, that not only is δι' ἀγγ. ἐν χειρὶ μεσ. regarded as lowering the authority of the law, but a quite undue stress is also laid upon προσετέθη; for in ver. 19 the emphasis lies on τῶν παραβ. χάριν. 9 Matthies[1] interprets: "*But the mediator . . . does not relate to one, for his nature is in fact divided or disunited, since he is placed between two sides or parties opposed to one another; and therefore in connection with him we cannot think of unity, but only of duality, or of the variance subsisting between two parties; but God is One, comprehends in Himself nothing but unity, so that His nature contains no variance or disunion.*" Thus also, in the main, de Wette,[2] and among the older expositors Jac. Cappellus. But the simple *numerical* conception of unity is thus arbitrarily transformed into the *philosophical* idea, and the contrast of *plurality* is turned into the contrast of *disunion*. How could a reader discover in ὁ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν anything else than the popular doctrine of Monotheism? 10. Schott: "*Mediator quidem non uni tantum (eidemque immutabili) addictus est homini s. parti, i.e., in quavis causa humana, quae mediatore indiget, duae certe adsunt partes, quibus* μεσίτης *inserviat, sive res inter duos tantum homines singulos transigatur, sive multitudo sit ingens eorum, qui alterutram vel utramque partem constituant (v. c. populus) . . . ubi plures imo multi ejusdem foederis participes sunt et fiunt (praesertim ubi maxima est singulorum vicissitudo, dum mortuis succedunt posteri), facile etiam mutatis animorum consiliis atque propositis, foedus mutatur aut tollitur,* μεσίτῃ *cujus ope constitutum fuerat haud impediente . . . proinde ex eo quidem, quod lex Sinaitica* ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου *promulgata est (ver. 19), non sequitur auctoritatem ei competere perpetuam [his verbis P. corrigere voluit perversam eorum opinionem, qui in defendenda legis auctoritate perpetua valitura ad personam Mosis mediatoris provocarent] . . . attamen Deus est unus, qui semper idem manet Deus immutabilis, foedus legislationis Sinaiticae non fuit humanae, sed divinae auctoritatis, neque ab arbitrio hominum, sed a voluntate Dei pendebat immutabilis. His perpendendis quaestio excitabatur (ver. 21), an forte haec legislatio Sinait. auctoritate divina insignis ipso Deo jubente promissionem Abrahamo datam ejusmodi limitibus circumscribere (mutare) voluerit, ut non amplius esset promissio, cujus eventus liberae tantum Dei gratiae adnecteretur,*" "A mediator, indeed, is not devoted to only one (and that too an immutable) man or party, *i.e.*, in every human cause that needs a mediator, there are undoubtedly two parties present which the mediator serves, whether the transaction be between only two individuals, or the multitude of those constituting one or the other party be great, *e.g.*, the people . . . where a number, aye, many are and become sharers in the same covenant (especially where the change of individuals is very great, when posterity succeed the dead), and where the designs and purposes of minds being easily changed, the covenant is easily changed or annulled, when the mediator by whose aid it was established does not hinder. . . . Hence from the fact that the Sinaitic law was promulgated 'in the hand of a mediator' (ver. 19) it does not follow that perpetual authority belongs thereto [by these words, Paul wished to correct the perverse opinion of those who in defending the perpetually valid authority of the law appealed to the authority of Moses]. . . . Yet God is one, who always remains the same immutable God, and the covenant of Sinaitic legislation was not of human, but of divine authority, and did not depend upon the will of men, but upon the will of the immutable God. In weighing these things, the question was excited (ver. 21) as to whether perhaps this Sinaitic legislation, notable by its divine authority, God himself commanding it, was intended to circumscribe (change) the promise given to Abraham by such limits, that it would be no longer a promise, whose issue would be dependent only upon the free grace of God." How much is supplied by the expositor in this interpretation, so copiously provided with modifying clauses! But it is decidedly erroneous, on account of the sense of *εἷς* and *ἑνός* being changed into the idea of *immutabilis*, "immutable,"[1] and also because the proposition *ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν* is limited to *causae humanae*, and yet the inference is supposed to be therein conveyed that the *Sinaitic legislation* is not always valid. Paul assuredly could never have thus illogically corrected the zealots for the law, and then in the very same breath have set aside the inference by *attamen Deus est unus*, "but nevertheless God is One." 11. Gurlitt[2] refers *ἑνός* to the *Gentile Christians*, as one of the two divisions of the *σπέρμα Ἀβρ.*: "*The law was given through angels and through a mediator, and God indeed is throughout only One; what proceeds from Him, therefore, demands in every case equal recognition. It must nevertheless be taken into consideration, that the mediator is no mediator of those who were previously Gentiles, and that therefore the law was not destined for the latter by God Himself.*" But, apart from the fact that in this view of *ἑνός* there must have been previous mention of a twofold posterity of Abraham and *τοῦ ἑνός* must have been here used, and not to mention that the *ἑνός* and *εἷς* are not taken as alike in sense, the interpretation must be at once pronounced decidedly wrong, because it depends upon the erroneous view that the *σπέρμα*, vv. 16, 19, means not merely Christ Himself, but also the *corpus mysticum*, "mystical body," of Christ. 12. Olshausen, taking *ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν* as: *God is one or a single one, and consequently only one party*, explains it thus: "Mediation presupposes a state of separation, and there can be no mediation in the case of one; since God is the one party, there must also have been a second, viz., men, who were separated from God. In the gospel it is otherwise: in Christ, the representative of the Church, all are one; all separations and distinctions are done away in Him" (ver. 28). Thus Paul, in order to call attention to the inferiority of the law to the gospel, gives a cursory, parenthetic explanation as to the idea of a mediator. This is (1) unsuitable to the context; for in ver. 19, *διαταγ. δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσ.* has set forth the *glory* of the giving of the law. (2) The idea: *and consequently also only one party*, is quite arbitrarily *added* to *ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν.* (3) In like manner, all the rest which is supposed properly

---

[1] This applies also against Kaiser's strange attempt (*de apologetic. Ev. Joh. consiliis*, Erl. 1824, p. 7 ff.) to obtrude the entirely foreign supplement of υἱός: "*Hic mediator Moses non est unius filius, Deus autem* (*nempe*) *est unus*," "This mediator, Moses, is not the son of one, but God is one." Moses is not to be compared with Christ, the only-begotten Son of God.

[2] This remark also applies to the very forced and arbitrary explanation of Mich. Weber (*Paraphr.* cap. III. *ep. ad. Gal.* 1863): "*Hic autem interventor* (*Moses*) *non est interventor unius illius posteritatis Abrahami, quam paulo ante Christianos esse dixi, Israelitarum* κατὰ πνεῦμα, *sed Israelitarum* κατὰ σάρκα *interventor quippe in quo spem suam fiduciamque ponunt* (Joh. ii. 45). *Ex hac igitur parte, in interventore, Israelitae* κατὰ σάρκα, *differunt ab Israelitis* κατὰ πνεῦμα, *quippe qui spem fiduciamque suam non in Mose, sed in solo Christo ponunt,* μεσίτῃ Θεοῦ κ. ἀνθρώπων (1 Tim. ii. 5). *In Deo autem* (ὁ γὲ Θεός) *nulla est diversitas; nihil discriminis Israelitis* κατὰ σάρκα *cum Israelitis* κατὰ πνεῦμα *intercedit, cundem Deum verum colunt illi quem hi-Deus est unus idemque. Utrique habent quidem* ἄλλον καὶ ἄλλον *interventorem, non autem* ἄλλον καὶ ἄλλον *Deum*," "This intercessor (Moses), however, is not the intercessor of that one posterity of Abraham, which shortly before I have said to be Christians, viz., the intercessor of Israelites according to the spirit, but of Israelites according to the flesh, since they put in him their hope and confidence (John ii. 45). In this respect, therefore, in the intercessor, Israelites according to the flesh differ from Israelites according to the spirit, since they put their hope and trust not in Moses, but in Christ alone, the mediator between God and men (1 Tim. ii. 5). In God, however, there is no diversity; no distinction intervenes between Israelites according to the flesh and Israelites according to the spirit; the former worship the same true God as the latter; their God is one and the same. They have different intercessors, but not different gods."

[3] And in εἷς the relation of God to the *Jews and Gentiles* would be arbitrarily assumed. This is also done by the anonymous writer, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, p. 331 ff., according to whom our passage is intended to assert that the mediator of the law was not only the mediator of God, but also had reference to the Jewish people, whereas God with His promise had reference to all the nations of the earth, both Jews and Gentiles.

[4] In the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1831. I. p. 106 f.

---

[1] *Beitr.* p. 187 f.

[2] *Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol.* II. 1, p. 31 ff.

---

[1] As in substance also Rinck, *Lucubr. crit.* p. 172 ff., and in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1834, p. 309 ff.

[2] According to him, the idea in the second clause is merely: "*that which God in Himself, irrespective of the disunion which has arisen between Him and men, has promised, is elevated above this disunion.*"

---

[1] For which Schott should not have appealed to Rom. iii. 30, Phil. i. 27.

[2] In the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1837, p. 805 ff.; 1843, p. 715 ff.

to constitute the sense of the words ("men, who were separated from God;" "in the gospel it is otherwise," etc.) is the pure invention of the expositor. 13. Matthias,[1] correctly explaining the first half of the verse, sees in ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν the minor premiss of an *enthymeme*, which has to be completed by supplying the major premiss and conclusion: "*If God is one of those two parties, the law, although ordained by angels, is nevertheless an ordinance of God; but God is this; and consequently the law, etc., is an ordinance, not of angels, but of God.*" Against this interpretation we may urge that the special connection with the point διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων is *not* conveyed by the text; that the explanation of εἷς by *alter* is contrary to the context; that ver. 21 would be unsuitably subjoined from a logical point of view (see on κατά, ver. 21); and lastly, that the idea of the law being an ordinance of God was one altogether undisputed and not needing any proof. 14. Ewald[2] assumes that Paul with this "quick flash of thought" intended to say: "The idea of the mediator necessarily presupposes two different living beings between whom, as being at variance or separated, mediation has to take place; because *the mediator of one is not*, does not *exist* at all, is an impossibility. But since *God* is in strictness only *One*, and does not consist of two inwardly different Gods or of an earlier and later God, it is evident that Moses as mediator did not mediate between the God of the promise and the God of the law, and thereby mix up the law with the promise and cancel the promise by the later law; but he only mediated (as is well known) between God and the people of that time." But even this interpretation, the thought of which would probably have been expressed most simply by Paul writing ὁ δὲ μεσίτης Θεοῦ ἐστιν, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν, is liable to the objections urged above (under 8) against Hermann's explanation. 15. According to Hofmann (compare also his *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 55 ff.), the *first* half of the verse is intended to affirm *that, where there is only one to whom something is to be given, there is no room for mediatorship;* such an individual recipient may receive it directly. Now, as the promise ran to Abraham's posterity *as an unity*, it is evident that the giving of the law, just because it was destined for a plurality of individuals, could be no fulfilment of the promise. The *second* half of the verse, which with δέ passes on to the *divine* side of the event, *places the unity of God in contradistinction to the plurality of angels; that which comes to men through the latter must be of a different kind from the promised gift, which the One was to give to the One—the one God to the one Christ.* Thus on this side also it is clear that the giving of the law was not the fulfilment of the promise, but was only ordained for the time, until Christ should come. But (*a*) all this artificial interpretation must at once fall to the ground, because it conceives ἑνός to be opposed to a plurality of *recipient* subjects; for it is not true that the bestowal through a mediator presupposes such a plurality, seeing that it may take place just as well with one as with many recipients. (*b*) It is incorrect that the unity of God is placed in contrast with the plurality of

---

[1] After several earlier attempts, according to his last view of 1866, in the monograph quoted at ver. 15.

[2] Comp. also his *Jahrb.* IV. p. 109.

angels (which is not even marked, by πολλῶν ἀγγ. or the like) : it stands in contrast to the ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, and it is untrue that the "*mediateness* of the giving involved its taking place through *many*"—just as if the mediate giving could not with equal fitness take place through one, as in fact it has very often been given by God through one ! (*c*) Paul's intention is, not to show that the giving of the law was not the *fulfilment* of the promise, but, as is clearly evident from ver. 21, to show that the law was *not opposed* to the promise. — 16. Wieseler : "*Moses as mediator, however* (δέ *being restrictive*), *has reference not merely to God* (*but also to men*) : *for a mediator from his nature has not reference to one* (but to two parties) ; *but God is one.* Consequently the failure of that mediatorial office of Moses was based on the fact, that he as *mediator* had to do *not* only with *God*, but also with *men*. The fault does not lie with the faithfulness *of God*, who appointed him as mediator,—an idea which cannot be entertained,—but rather with the action of men," etc. Against this interpretation it may be urged, not only that the words εἷς ἐστιν imperceptibly acquire the sense : *is only one of the two parties*, which Paul would certainly have been able to express otherwise than by the confession of monotheism (Deut. vi. 4 ; Jas. ii. 19 ; Rom. iii. 30 ; 1 Cor. viii. 4, 6, *et al*)., but also that the idea of a *failure* on the part of the law-giving, and of the blame due for it, was remote from the apostle's mind, and would here be unsuitable to the divine purpose expressed in ver. 19. The law became to men the δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας, "strength of sin" (1 Cor. xv. 56) ; but this falls to be regarded not as *a failure* on the part of the law-giving, but as a necessary *stage in the development of the divine plan of salvation* (ver. 22 ff. ; Rom. vii.). 17. According to Stölting,[1] ἑνός and εἷς are to be taken in the sense of *absolute unity*. Ver. 20 is supposed to contain a *syllogism with a suppressed conclusion :* viz., A mediator does not belong to one ; but God is one ; consequently a mediator does not belong to God. Accordingly God is *absolutely excluded from any mediation through the law :* the objects of this mediation are on the one hand the *Jews*, and on the other hand their contrast, *the Gentiles ;* and the law was to unite these two dissociated parts, which it effected by showing that the Jews were *in need of* redemption, and by making the Gentiles *capable* of redemption (Rom. iii. 22 f., 29 f.). The mediator, with the law in his hand, is supposed to have placed himself *between Jews and Gentiles*, and to have made both *equal* through the law,—an *equalization* which does *not take place with God*, as there is not one God of the Jews and another God of the Gentiles, between whom mediation might occur, but only a single God, who treats Jews and Gentiles with equal justice, being, as He is, a single Person without opponent, an absolute unity. Even this acutely carried out interpretation is not tenable : for (*a*) the reader finds no indication in the text that ἑνός and εἷς are to be taken in the pregnant sense of *absoluteness ;* and Paul, in order to be understood, must at least have written, in the second half of the verse, something like ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ὁ ὄντως εἷς (or ὁ ἁπλῶς εἷς) ἐστιν, "God is actually or absolutely one. Nor (*b*) is it correct that absolute unity excludes the being an object of mediation; because the absolutely one God has allowed mediation to take place between Himself and man, not only through Christ, but also in the ancient history of salvation, through His ministers (the angels, Moses, and the prophets). (*c*) There is nothing in the words of the passage to make us think of the Jews and Gentiles as objects of the mediation; since the law is rather to be recognized as the *μεσότοιχον*, "middle wall" (Eph. ii. 14) between the two, which had to be removed by Christ in order to their union. To the national consciousness, not only of the apostle, but also of his readers, *God and Israel* could alone occur as the parties reconciled with one another through the *μεσίτης*. (*d*) It is not correct that the conclusion drawn from ver. 20 is not expressed. It is expressed in ver. 21, and rejected as erroneous.—Lastly, Rückert confines himself to the correct translation of the words, "*The mediator does not refer to one* (but always to more than one); *but God is one;*" from which is to be concluded, "*Therefore the mediator does not refer to God alone, but also to others.*" He, however, at the same time confesses that he does not see any way, in which these propositions and this conclusion are to be connected with the foregoing passage, so as to yield any relevant and lucid thought. While Rückert has thus despaired of an explanation on his own part, he has not questioned the title of the passage to receive an explanation. But this course, to which Michaelis was already inclined,[1] has been actually adopted by Lücke,[2] who holds ver. 20 to be a *gloss*, which had originally served, on the one hand, to explain the conclusion of ver. 19 (the mediator was interpreted as applying to Christ, and it was desirable to point out that this mediator belonged not merely to the Jews, but also to the Gentiles), and, on the other, to give a reason for the beginning of ver. 21. But the witnesses in favor of its genuineness[3] are so decisively unanimous, that no other passage can appear better attested. Lücke only makes use of an *argumentum a silentio*,—namely, that Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Origen do not cite our verse;[4] but little stress can be laid on this, when we consider how lightly in general the Fathers were wont to pass over the words in question, without even discerning in them any special importance or difficulty. [See Note L., p. 161.]

---

[1] *Beiträge z. Exeg. d. Paul. Br.* 1869, p. 86 ff.

Ver. 21. *ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν;*] *οὖν*, the reference of which is differently explained according to the different interpretations of ver. 20, draws an inference, *not* from the definition of the object of the law in ver. 19,[5] but from ver. 20, which is not arbitrarily to be set aside, or to be treated merely as an appendage of ver. 19.[1] The law, namely, which was given through a mediator, and therefore essentially otherwise than the promise, might thereby appear to introduce on the part of God another way of granting the Messianic salvation than the promises, and consequently to be *opposed to* the latter.[2] — *κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν*] See vv. 8, 16. The *κατά* is the usual *contra*, *in opposition to.* Matthias incorrectly explains it : "Is it included *under the idea* of the promises ?" Since the simple *ἐστί*—and not, possibly, *τάσσεται*, "arrayed"[3]—is to be supplied, the expression would be wholly without the sanction of usage. Moreover, looking to the specific difference in the ideas of the two things, Paul *could* not have asked such a question at all. — *εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος κ.τ.λ*] ground assigned for the *μὴ γένοιτο*, and therefore proof that it would be incorrect to conclude from ver. 20 that the law was opposed to the promises. For if it had been opposed to the promises, *the law* must have been in a position to procure life ;[4] and if this were so, then would righteousness actually be *from the law*,[5] which, according to the Scriptures, cannot be the case (ver. 22). — *νόμος*] just as in the whole context : the *Mosaic law*, although without the article, as in ii. 21, iii. 11, 18 ; Winer, p. 117. — *ὁ δυνάμ. ζωοπ.*] The article marks off the definite quality which, in the words *εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος*, is conceived by the law-giver as belonging to the law:[6] *as that which is able to give life ;* and this is the *point* of this conditional sentence. — *ζωοποιῆσαι*] "Hoc verbo praesupponitur *mors* peccatori intentata," "By this word, the *death* threatened against the sinner is presupposed," Bengel. The *ζωή*, however, which the law is not able to furnish, is not the *being alive morally*,[7] but, in harmony with the context, *the everlasting Messianic life* (see Käuffer, *de bibl. ζωῆς αἰωνίου notione*, p. 75), as is evident from ver. 18 (*εἰ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου ἡ κληρονομία*) and from ver. 22. Comp. also 2 Cor. iii. 6. The *moral* quickening is *presupposed* in this *ζωοποιῆσαι.* The law, in itself good and holy, could not subdue the dominion of the principle of sin in man (Rom. viii. 3), but rather necessarily served to promote this dominion (see on ver. 19), and was therefore unable to bring about the eternal life which was dependent on obedience to the law (ver. 12): given unto life, it was found unto death, Rom. vii. 10. Paul never uses *ζωοποιεῖν* of the *moral* quickening, nor *συζωοποιεῖν* either (Eph. ii. 5 ; Col. ii. 13). The *ζωή* is the eternal life which is manifested at the *Parousia* (Col. iii. 3 f.), and therefore in reality the *κληρονομία*

---

[1] "I wished, in fact, that it were allowable for me in the explanation to pass over the whole verse, and to give it out as a marginal note of some reader not understanding Paul, which had found its way into the text."—Michaelis, *Paraphr.* p. 33, ed. 2.

[2] In the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1828, p. 83 ff.

[3] There is not even the slightest variation in the individual words, or in their arrangement,—a fact which, judging by critical analogy, would be scarcely conceivable in a text compiled from a double gloss. Only the Æth. adds *duorum* at the end, evidently an exegetical addition, the author of which appears to have had in his mind some explanation which bore a similarity to that of Clarke, Locke, Winer, or Gurlitt.

[4] Clement of Alexandria has it at least once, in the *Theodot.* ed. Col. p. 797 A.

[5] Castalio, Luther, Gomarus, Pareus, Estius, Bengel, and others, including Lücke, Olshausen, de Wette, Wieseler, Hofmann, Stölting.

---

[1] Also in 1 Cor. vi. 15, *οὖν* (in opposition to Stölting's appeal to the passage) introduces a possible (mischievous) inference from *what immediately precedes*, to be at once repelled with horror by *μὴ γένοιτο.*

[2] See the fuller statement at ver. 20.

[3] See Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 272.

[4] This consequence depends upon the dilemma: Life may be procured *either* through the promises *or* through the law. If, therefore, the law stands in opposition to the promises, so that the latter shall no longer be valid, the *law* must be able to procure life. This dilemma is correct, because no *third* possibility is given in the divine plan of salvation.

[5] Even if *ἄν* be not genuine, this interpretation is not altered (Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 194, 6) ; and we cannot explain (with Hofmann): "If there *was* given, etc., then *was*," etc. This *imperfect* (*erat*) would be illogical ; Paul would have written *ἐστίν* or *γέγονεν.*

[6] Winer, p. 127 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 7, 13.

[7] Winer, Rückert, Matthies, Olshausen, Ewald, Wieseler, Hauck, Hofmann, Buhl, and others, following older expositors.

(vv. 18, 29).[1] — ὄντως ἐκ νόμου ἂν ἦν ἡ δικαιοσύνη] *then in reality* (not merely in Jewish imagination) *the law would be that, from which the existence of righteousness would proceed*, namely, by its enabling men to offer complete obedience. The argument proceeds *ab effectu*, "from the effect" (ζωοποιῆσαι), *ad causam*, "to the cause" (ἡ δικαιοσύνη), for, without being righteous before God, man cannot attain eternal life : not as Rückert, Wieseler, Hofmann, and others, in accordance with their view of ζωοπ., are compelled to assume, *a causa* (the new moral life whereby the law is fulfilled) *ad effectum*, "for the effect" (the δικαιοσύνη which would be acquired by the fulfilment of the law). The relation between ζωοποιῆσαι and ἡ δικαιοσύνη is aptly indicated by Oecumenius : οὐκ ἔσωσεν οὐδὲ ἐδικαίωσεν, "neither saved nor justified," and by Bengel : "Justitia est *vitae fundamentum*, "Righteousness is the foundation of life."

Ver. 22. But the case supposed (ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμ. ζωοποιῆσαι) does not exist : for, on the contrary, according to the Scriptures all men have been subjected to the dominion of sin, and the purpose of God therein was, that the promised salvation should not come from the law, but should be bestowed on believers on account of faith in Christ. [See Note LI., p. 161.] What sort of position is assigned under these circumstances to *the law*, is then stated in ver. 23. — συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφὴ κ.τ.λ.] Scripture is personified, as in ver. 8. That which *God* has done, because it is divinely revealed and attested in Scripture (see Rom. iii. 9–19) and thereby appears an infallible *certainty*, is represented as the *act* of *Scripture*, which the latter, as in its utterances the professed *self-revelation of God, has accomplished.* The Scripture—that is, when regarded apart from the personification, God, according to the divine testimony of the Scripture—*has brought all into ward under sin*, that is, has put the whole of mankind without exception into the relation of bondage, in which sin (comp. Rom. iii. 9) has them, as it were, under lock and key, so that they cannot escape from this control and attain to moral freedom. On the figurative expression, and on the conception of the matter as a divine *measure* (not a mere declaration), compare on Rom. xi. 32. Following Chrysostom (ἤλεγξεν) and others, Hermann finds the sense : "*per legem demum cognitum esse peccatum*," "that only by the law is sin known" (Rom. vii. 7 f., iii. 19 ff.), which, however, does not correspond with the significance of the carefully-chosen συνέκλεισεν, and is also at variance with ἡ γραφή, which is by no means[2] equivalent to νόμος, but denotes the O. T., whilst ὁ νόμος in the whole connection is the *institute* of the law. The *bond of guilt* which is implied in the dominion of sin is obvious of itself, without any need for explaining ἁμαρτίαν as the *guilt* of sin. — Moreover, the *emphasis* is on the prefixed συνέκλεισεν : *included*, so that freedom, that is, the attainment of δικαιοσύνη, is not to be thought of. Συγκλείειν, however, does not denote : to include *together*, *with one another*, as Bengel, Usteri, and others hold,[3] which is clearly proved by the fact that the word is very often used of the shutting up of *one*, unaccompanied by others;[1] but *συν* corresponds to the idea of *complete* custody, so that the enclosed are entirely and absolutely held in by the barriers in question.[2] — *τὰ πάντα*] *the collective whole*, not: *all which man ought to do* (Ewald), but like *τοὺς πάντας*, Rom. xi. 32. The *neuter* used of *persons*, who are thus brought under the point of view of the general category: the *totality*.[3] According to Calvin, Beza, Wolf, Bengel, and others (comp. also Hofmann), *τὰ πάντα* is supposed to refer not merely to men, but *also to everything which they are, have, or do*. But the figurative *συνέκλεισεν*, and also the context by *τοῖς πιστεύουσι* and the *personal* indications contained in ver. 23 ff., give the preference to our interpretation. Besides, *τὰ πάντα*, taken of things, would mean *all things*,[4] which is here unsuitable.[5] — *ἵνα ἡ ἐπαγγελία κ.τ.λ.*] the purpose *of God*, because that which was previously represented as the action of *Scripture* was in reality the action of *God*.[6] — *ἡ ἐπαγγελία*] *that which was promised*, a sense which the *abstract* receives through *δοθῇ*.[7] That which is meant is the promised gift, already well known from the context, namely, the *κληρονομία*, vv. 16, 18. — *ἐκ πίστεως*] not from obedience to the law, which with that subjection under the control of sin was impossible, but so that the divine bestowal proceeds, as regards its subjective cause, *from faith in Jesus Christ*.[8] The emphasis is on this *ἐκ πίστ. Ἰ. Χ.*, and not on *ἐπαγγελία* (Hofmann).[9] — *τοῖς πιστεύουσι*] is explained by Winer and others as an apparent tautology arising from the importance of this proposition (and therefore *emphatic*); but without adequate ground;[10] the expression, on the contrary, is quite in keeping with the circumstances of the Galatians. That salvation was intended *for believers*, was not denied; but they held to the opinion that obedience to the law must necessarily be the procuring cause of this salvation. Paul therefore says: in order that, *in virtue of faith in Jesus Christ*, not in virtue of obedience to the law, salvation should be given to the believers—so that thus the believers have no need of *anything further* than faith.[11]

---

[1] Comp. ζήσεται, ver. 12, to which our ζωοπ. glances back.

[2] As, following the Fathers (but not Theodoret), Beza, Calvin, Baumgarten, Crusius and others think.

[3] Not even in Rom. xi. 32.

Ver. 23. *Δέ*] no longer connected with *ἀλλά* (Hofmann), but leading over to a new portion of the statement (the counterpart to which is to follow in ver. 25),—namely, to the position which *the law* held under the circumstances expressed in ver. 25. Before the introduction of faith, it was to guard and maintain those who belonged to it in this relation of bondage, so that they should not get rid of it and become free,—a liberation which was reserved for the *faith* which was to come. — *πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν*] *δέ* in the *third* place with the *prepositional* phrase.[1] —Here also πίστις is neither *doctrina fidem postulans*, "the doctrine demanding faith," the *gospel*, as most ancient expositors and Schott think, nor the *dispensation* of faith,[2] but *subjective faith*, which is treated objectively. Comp. on i. 23, iii. 2. As long as there was not yet any belief in Christ, faith was not yet present; but when on the preaching of the gospel men believed in Christ, the faith, which was previously wanting, *had come*, that is, had now set in, had presented itself,—namely, in the hearts of those who had become believers. On ἐλθεῖν as applied to mental things and states, which set in, comp. Pind. *Nem.* i. 48 (*hopes*);. Plat. *Pol.* iii. p. 402 A (*understanding*); Soph. *O. R.* 681 (δόκησις, *opinion*). Comp. also Rom. vii. 9. —ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα συγκλειόμενοι] (see the critical notes): *under the law we were held in custody*, *so that we were placed in ward* with a view to the faith about to be revealed. The subject is: *we Jewish Christians* (ver. 25); the emphasis is on ὑπὸ νόμον, and afterwards on πίστιν. The law is represented as a ruler, *under whose dominion* (ὑπὸ νόμον) those who belonged to it were held in moral captivity, as in a prison; so that they, as persons shut up in the φρουρά, "ward," under lock and key, were placed beyond the possibility of liberation—which was only to ensue by means of the faith that was to be revealed in the future.[3] The words and the context do not yield more than this: the *paedagogic* efficacy of the law is not *inferred* till ver. 24, and is not to be anticipated here. This view is opposed to that of many expositors,[4] who find already expressed here that *paedagogic function*, which, however, is understood in the sense of the "usus *politicus*," "political use," of the law (but see on ver. 24): "in severam legis disciplinam, *quae ne in omnem libidinem effunderemur cavit*, traditi," "delivered to the strict discipline of the law, which guarded us from giving ourselves over to every lust," Winer. But the whole explanation of the law guarding *from sin* (to which also Wieseler refers ἐφρουρ.) is opposed to the correct interpretation of τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν (ver. 19), and also to ver. 22. The captivity so forcibly described by Paul is just the *sinful* bondage under the law, Rom. vii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 56. Observe, moreover, in order to a just understanding of the passage, that ὑπὸ νόμον, according to the very position of the words, cannot without proceeding arbitrarily be connected with συγκλ.[5]—a connection which is not warranted by the other thought, ver. 22,—but must be joined to ἐφρουρ ;[1] and further, that the present participle συγκλειόμενοι (with the εἰς τὴν μέλλ. κ.τ.λ. belonging to it) forms the *modal definition* of ἐφρουρούμεθα, representing the *continued* operation of the latter, which, constantly appearing in fresh acts, renders liberation impossible. Hofmann[2] understands συγκλείειν εἰς in the sense *of constraining to something;* it expresses in his view the constraining power, with which subjection to the law served to keep the people directed towards the faith which was to be revealed in the future.[3] Such an use of the phrase is indubitably found among later Greek authors, and is especially frequent in Polybius ;[4] but how improbable, and in fact incredible it is, that Paul should have here used this word in a different sense from that in which he used it immediately before in ver. 22, and in the kindred passage, Rom. xi. 32 (he has it not elsewhere)! This sense could not have occurred to any reader. Besides, the idea of constraint *against one's will*, which must be conveyed in συγκλειόμ. εἰς,[5] and which Hofmann obliterates ("the law conferred on the people *its distinctive position*, and its *abiding* in this distinctive position was at the same time an abiding *directed towards* the *faith* that was to come"), would neither agree with the text (vv. 22, 24) nor harmonize with history.[6] —εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι] As εἰς in ver. 24 is evidently to be understood as *telic*, and as the temporal interpretation *usque ad*, "up to,"[7] after πρὸ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν, which includes in itself the *terminus ad quem*, would be very unmeaning, εἰς is to be explained : *towards the faith*, that is, with the *design*, that we should pass over into the state of faith. Luther (1519) aptly remarks : "in hoc, ut fide futura liberaremur," "in this, that we should be freed by future faith." In accordance with the view of Oecumenius, Theophylact, Augustine, Calovius, Raphel, Bengel, Hofmann, εἰς κ.τ.λ. is to be connected with συγκλειόμενοι, because the latter, without this annexation of the telic statement εἰς κ.τ.λ., would not form a *characteristic* modal definition of ἐφρουρ. This εἰς κ.τ.λ. is, in the history of salvation, the divine aim of that σύγκλεισις, which was to cease on its attainment ; Christ is the end of the law. Comp. ver. 22, where ἵνα κ.τ.λ. corresponds with the εἰς κ.τ.λ. here. —μέλλουσαν] is placed first,[8] because with that *earlier* situation is contrasted the *subsequent future* state of things which was throughout the object of its aim.[9] —ἀποκαλυφθῆναι] for so long as there was not yet belief in Christ, faith had not yet made its appearance : it was still an element of life *hidden* in the counsel of God, which became *revealed* as a historical phenomenon, when Christ had come and the gospel—the preaching of faith (vv. 2, 5)—was made known. Ἀποκαλ. cannot be understood as the infinitive of *design* and, according to the reading συγκεκλεισμένοι, as belonging to the latter word,[1] because in the religious-historical connection of the text it must signify the final appearance of the blessing of salvation, which hitherto as a μυστήριον, "mystery," had been unknown (Rom. xvi. 25). Besides, Paul would thus have written very far from clearly: he must at least have placed the infinitive before συγκεκλεισ.

---

[1] 1 Sam. xxiv. 19; Ps. xxxi. 9; Polyb. xi. 2. 10; 1 Macc. xi. 66, xii. 7.

[2] Comp. Herod. vii. 129: *λίμνη συγκληϊσμένη πάντοθεν*, "a harbor shut in from every side," Eur. *Hec.* 487; Polyb. i. 17. 8, i. 51. 10, iii. 117. 11; also Plat. *Tim.* p. 71 C, where it is used with *ἐμφράττειν*; 1 Macc. iv. 31, v. 5. *Una includere*, "shut in together," would be *συγκατακλείειν*, Herod. i. 182; Lucian, *Vit. aubt.* 9, *D. mort.* xiv. 4.

[3] See on 1 Cor. i. 27; Arrian. v. 22. 1.

[4] Xen. *Mem.* i. 11; Rom. xi. 36, *et al.*

[5] Comp. on the matter itself, Rom. iii. 9, 19.

[6] Therefore we must not (with Semler, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Winer, Matthias, and others) explain it "logically: that it might appear to be given," etc.

[7] Comp. ver. 14.

[8] Comp. ver. 8.

[9] See ver. 23 ff.

[10] Passages such as ver. 9, Rom. i. 17, Phil. iii. 9, are not relevant here.

[11] Comp. v. 4 f.

---

[1] See Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 397; Klotz, *ad Devar.* II. p. 378 f.

[2] Buhl, comp. Rückert.

[3] If, with Winer, Usteri, and Schott, ἐφρουρ. is explained merely as *asservabamur* (1 Pet. i. 5),—comp. Hofmann, "we were *held in keeping*,"—it yields, according to the connection with συγκεκλεισμένοι, and with the inference thereupon of the *paedagogic function* of the law, too weak a thought. Comp. Wisd. xvii. 16. Luther, Calvin, and many others, including Rückert and de Wette, have rightly found in ἐφρουρ. and συγκεκλ. the figurative idea of a prison (φρούριον Plat. *Ax.* p. 365 E; φρουρά, Plat. *Phaed.* p. 62 ff). The prison, however, is not the law itself; but the latter is the ruler, under whose power the captives are in prison,—because, namely, under the law, as the δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας (1 Cor. xv. 56), they are not in a position to attain to the freedom of moral life.

[4] Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Grotius, Estius, Winer, Rückert, Schott, Ewald, and others.

[5] So de Wette, Wieseler, and many others, also my own former interpretation.

---

[1] Augustine and many others, also Hofmann, Reithmayr, Buhl.

[2] Comp. his *Schriftbew*, II. 2, p. 59.

[3] Raphel, *Polyb*. p. 518, has understood συγκλείειν εἰς in a similar way to Hofmann, and finely paraphrased it : "eo necessitatis quem adigere, ut ad fidem tanquam sacram ancoram confugere cogatur," "to drive with such a degree of necessity, that it is compelled to betake itself to faith as a sacred anchor." Comp. Bengel.

[4] See Raphel, and Schweighäuser, *Lex. Polyb*. p. 571 f.

[5] See Fritzsche, *ad Rom*. II. p. 545.

[6] Rom. xi. ; Acts xxviii. 25 ff.

[7] Erasmus, Grotius, Michaelis, Koppe, Morus, Rosenmüller, Rückert, Usteri, and others.

[8] Paul did not write εἰς τ. πίστ. τ. μέλλ. ἀποκ.

[9] Comp. on Rom. viii. 18. Similarly in 1 Pet. v. 1, 2 Macc. viii. 11.

Ver. 24. *Accordingly the law has become our paedagogue unto Christ.* As a *paedagogue*[2] has his wards in guidance and training for the aim of their future majority, so the law has taken us into a guidance and training, of which Christ was the aim, that is, of which the aim was that we in due time should no longer be under the law, but should belong to Christ. This *munus paedagogicum*, "pedagogical office," however, resulting from ver. 23, did not consist in the *restriction of sin*,[3] or in the circumstance that the law "*ab inhonestis minarum asperitate deterreret*," "by the asperity of its threats deterred from dishonorable things,"[4]—views decidedly inconsistent with the aim expressed in ver. 19, and with the tenor of ver. 23, which by no means expresses the idea of preparatory improvement; but it consisted in this, that the law prepared those belonging to it for the future reception of Christian salvation (justification by faith) in such a manner that, by virtue of the principle of sin which it excited, it continually brought about and promoted transgressions (ver. 19; Rom. vii. 5 ff.), thereby held the people in moral bondage (in the φρουρά, ver. 23), and by producing at the same time the acknowledgment of sin (Rom. iii. 20) powerfully brought home to the heart (Rom. vii. 24) the sense of guilt and of the need of redemption from the divine wrath (Rom. iv. 15),—a redemption which, with our natural moral impotence, was not possible by means of the law itself (Rom. iii. 19 f., viii. 3). Luther appropriately remarks: "Lex enim ad gratiam praeparat, dum peccatum revelat et auget, humilians superbos ad auxilium Christi desiderandum," "For the law prepares for grace, while it reveals and amplifies sin, humbling the proud to desire Christ's aid."[5] Under this paedagogal discipline man finally cries out: ταλαίπωρος ἐγώ, Rom. vii. 24. — εἰς Χριστόν] not *usque ad* Christum, "until Christ,"[6] but designating the end aimed at, as is shown by ἵνα ἐκ π. δικ.; comp. ver. 23. Chrysostom and his successors,[7] Erasmus, Zeger, Elsner, and others, refer εἰς to the idea that the law πρὸς τὸν Χριστόν, ὅς ἐστιν ὁ διδάσκαλος, ἀπῆγε, "led to Christ, who is the teacher," just as the *paedagogi* had to conduct the boys to the schools and gymnasia.[1] But this introduces the idea of Christ as a *teacher*, which is foreign to the passage ; He is conceived of as *reconciler* (ἵνα ἐκ πίστ. δικ.) [See Note LII., p. 162.] — *ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθ.*] is the *divine destination*, which the paedagogic function of the law was to fulfil in those who were subject to it. The emphatic ἐκ πίστεως (*by faith*, not by the law) shows how erroneously the paedagogic efficacy of the law is referred to the restriction of sin.

---

[1] Matthias: "in order to become manifest, as those who were under the ban with a view to the future faith."

[2] See on 1 Cor. iv. 15.

[3] Comp. Liban. *D.* xxv. p. 576 C: πρῶτον μὲν νομῷ παιδαγωγήσομεν αὐτῶν τὴν προαίρεσιν, ὡς ἂν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ζημίαν ἀναδυόμεναι σωθρονεῖν ἀναγκάζωνται, "at first by means of the law we will moderate their course of life, that, avoiding the penalty from the law, they may be compelled to be discreet." Comp. also Simplic. *Epict.* 10, p. 116, ed. Schweigh.; and see Grotius on our passage.

[4] Winer, and most expositors, including de Wette, Baur, Hofmann, Reithmayr, but not Usteri, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler.

[5] See also Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 287 f.; Holsten, *z. Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 315 f.

[6] Castalio, J. Cappellus, Morus, Rosenmüller, Rückert, Matthias.

[7] See Suicer, *Thes.* II. pp. 421, 544.

Ver. 25. No longer dependent on the ὥστε in ver. 24. Paul now desires to unfold the beautiful picture of the salvation *which had come*. — οὐκέτι] This is the *breathing afresh of freedom*. On the matter itself, comp. Rom. vi. 14, x. 4, vii. 25. — ὑπὸ παιδαγ.] without article : *under tutorial power*.

Ver. 26. The *argumentative emphasis* is laid first on πάντες, and then, not on υἱοί,—which expositors have been wont to understand in the pregnant sense : sons *of full age*, *free*, in contrast to the παισί implied in παιδαγωγός,[2]—but on υἱοὶ Θεοῦ, because in this Θεοῦ the υἱοί actually *has* its express and full definition, and therefore *to supply* the defining idea is quite unwarrantable. *All* of you are sons *of God* by means of *faith ;*[3] but where all without exception and without distinction are sons of God, and are so through faith, none can be, like Israel before the appearance of faith, under the dominion of the law, because the new state of life, that of *faith*, is something altogether different,—namely, fellowship with the υἱότης of Christ (ver. 27). To be a son *of God* through *faith*, and to be under the old *tutorial training*, are contradictory relations, one of which excludes the other. The higher, and in fact perfect relation,[4] excludes the lower. — πάντες] Paul now speaks in the *second* person, because what is said in ver. 26 f. held good, *not* of the Jewish Christians alone (of whom he previously spoke in the *first* person), but of *all Christians in general as such*, consequently of *all his readers* whom he now singles out for address ; whether they may have previously been Jews or Gentiles, now they are *sons of God*. Hofmann supposes that Paul meant by the *second* person his *Gentile-Christian* readers, and wished to employ what he says of them in proof of his assertion respecting those who had been previously subject to the law. In this case he must, in order to be intelligible, have used some such words as καὶ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἔθνη πάντες κ.τ.λ. According to the expression in the second person used without any limitation, the *Galatian Christians* must have considered themselves addressed *as a whole* without distinction,—a view clearly confirmed to them by the ὅσοι (ver. 27), and the Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλλην comp. with πάντες ὑμεῖς (ver. 28). Where, on the other hand, Paul is thinking of the Galatians as *Gentile Christians* (so far as the majority of them actually were so), this may be simply gathered from the context (iv. 8).—ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] belongs to πίστεως. According to the construction πιστεύειν ἐν τινι,[1] ἡ πίστις ἐν Χριστῷ is *fides in Christo reposita*, the faith resting in Christ; the words being correctly, in point of grammar, combined so as to form *one* idea.[2] But Usteri, Schott, Hofmann, Wieseler, Ewald, Matthias, Reithmayr (Estius also pronouncing it allowable), join ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. with υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ἐστε, of which it is alleged to be the modal definition; specially explaining the sense, either as "*utpote Christo prorsus addicti*" (Schott), or of the "*inclusion in Christ*" (Hofmann), or as assigning the *objective ground* of the sonship, which has its subjective ground in διὰ τ. πίστ. (Wieseler; comp. Hofmann and Buhl). But all these elements are already obviously involved in διὰ τ. πίστ. itself, so that ἐν Χ. Ἰ., as parallel to διὰ τ. π., would be simply superfluous and awkward; whereas, connected with διὰ τ. π., it expresses the *emphatic* and indeed *solemn completeness* of this idea (comp. ver. 22), in accordance with the great thought of the sentence, coming in all the more forcibly at the end, as previously in the case of ἐλθεῖν (ver. 23) and ἐλθούσης (ver. 25) the πίστις was mentioned *without* its object, and the latter was left to be understood as a matter of course.

---

[1] Plat. *Lys.* p. 208 C ; Dem. 313. 12 ; Ael. *V. H.* iii. 21.

[2] See, against this view, Wieseler and Matthias.

[3] διὰ τ. πίστ. stands *third* in the order of emphasis, but has not the main stress laid upon it in contradistinction to the πάντες (Hofmann), as if it stood immediately after πάντες γάρ.

[4] Theodoret aptly remarks : ἔδειξε τῶν πεπιστευκότων τὸ τέλειον· τί γὰρ τελειότερον τῶν υἱῶν χρηματιζόντων Θεοῦ, "He showed that which is complete in those who have believed ; for what is more complete than sons enjoying communion with God?"

Ver. 27. The words just used, υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ἐστε, expressing what the readers as a body are through faith in Christ, are now confirmed by the mention of the *origin* of this relation; and the ground on which the relation is based is, that Christ is the *Son* of God.[3]—ὅσοι] corresponding to the emphatic πάντες in ver. 26.—εἰς Χριστόν] *in relation to Christ*,[4] so that ye who belong to Christ through baptism become partakers in fellowship of life with Him.—Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε] laying aside the figure, according to the connection: Ye have appropriated the same peculiar state of life, that is, the very same specific relation to God, in which Christ stands; consequently, as He is the Son of God, ye have likewise *entered into the sonship of God*, namely by means of the πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας received at baptism.[5] Observe, besides, how baptism necessarily presupposes the μετάνοια (Acts ii. 38) and faith.[6] The *entrance on the state of being included in Christ*, as Hofmann from the point of view of εἶναι ἐν Χ. explains the expression, is likewise tantamount to the obtaining a share in the sonship of God. The figure, derived from the putting on of a characteristic dress,[7] is familiar both to the Greek authors and the Rabbins.[1] In the latter passage the putting on of Christ is *enjoined*, but it is here represented as *having taken place;* for in that passage it is conceived under the *ethical*, but here under the primary *dogmatic*, point of view.[2] Usteri incorrectly desires to find in the ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν of our passage, not the entering into the sonship of God, but the *putting on of the new man* (Col. iii. 9–11), having especial reference to the thought of the universalistic, purely human element, in which all the religious differences which have hitherto separated men from one another are done away. This view is inconsistent with the word actually used (Χριστόν), and with the context (υἱοὶ Θεοῦ, ver. 26). Nevertheless, Wieseler has in substance supported the view of Usteri, objecting to our interpretation that υἱοὶ Θεοῦ expresses a sonship of God different from that of *Christ*, who was *begotten* of God. It is true that Christians are the sons of God only by *adoption* (υἱοθεσία); but just by means of this new relation entered upon in baptism, they have morally and legally entered into the like state of life with the only-begotten Son, and have become, although only His brethren *by adoption*, still His *brethren.*[3] This is sufficient to justify the conception of having put on Christ, wherein the metaphysical element of difference subsists, as a matter of course, but is left out of view. On the legal aspect of the relation, comp. ver. 29; Rom. viii. 17. — Moreover, that the formula ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι is not to be explained from the idea Χριστὸν ἐνδύσασθαι, see in Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 82. Just as little, however, is the converse course to be adopted (Hofmann), because both εἶναι ἐν τινι and ἐνδύσασθαί τινα or τι are frequently used in the N. T. and out of it, without any correlation of the two ideas necessarily existing. The two stand independently side by side, although in point of *fact* it is correct that whosoever *is* ἐν Χριστῷ has *put on* Christ through baptism.

---

[1] See Mark i. 15; Eph. i. 13; LXX. Ps. lxxviii. 22; Jer. xii. 6; Clem. 1 Cor. 22: ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ πίστις, Ignat. *ad Philad.* 8: ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ οὐ πιστεύω.

[2] See Winer, p. 128; Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 63, *ad Rom.* I. p. 195 f. Comp. Eph. i. 1, 15; Col. i. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 13.

[3] Comp. Chrysostom: εἰ ὁ Χριστος υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, σὺ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐνδέδυσαι τὸν υἱὸν ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁμοιωθεὶς εἰς μιαν συγγένειανκαὶ μίαν ἰδέαν ἤχθης, "If Christ is the Son of God and you have put on Him, having the Son in himself, you also, being made like Him, have been brought into one family and one image." Luther, 1519: "*Si autem Christum induistis, Christus autem filius Dei, et vos eodem indumento filii Dei estis,*" "But if you have put on Christ and Christ is the Son of God, by the same garment you are sons of God."

[4] See on Rom. vi. 3.

[5] iv. 5–7; Rom. viii. 15; 1 Cor. vi. 11; Tit. iii. 5.

[6] Comp. Neander, II. p. 778 f.; Messner, *Lehre der Ap.* p. 279.

[7] Looking at the very general occurrence of the figure, and seeing that the context contains no indication whatever of any special reference, we must entirely reject any historical or ritual references. See the many discussions of the earlier expositors in Wolf. By some the figure was looked upon as referring to *heathen* customs (as Bengel: "Christus nobis est," "Christ is to us

Ver. 28. After ye have thus put on Christ, the distinctions of your various relations of life apart from Christianity have vanished; from the standpoint of this new condition they have no further validity, any more than if they were not in existence. — ἔνι] is an abbreviated form for ἔνεστι (1 Cor. vi. 5; Col. iii. 11; Jas. i. 17), not the adverbially used preposition,[4] as Winer, Usteri, Wieseler, and others assume, with the accent thrown back. Against this view it is decisive, that very frequently ἔνι and ἐν are used together,[5] and yet there is no ἐστί added, whereby the ἔνι shows that it stands independently as a compound word = ἔνεστι or ἔνεισι.[6] Translate: *there is not*, namely, in this state of things when ye have all put on Christ, *a Jew*, etc. The ὑμεῖς in vv. 28, 29 shows that the *individualizing* form of

---

the *toga virilis*"), by others to *Jewish* customs ("it applies to the putting on of the robes of the high priest at his appointment," Deyling, *Obss.* III. p. 480, ed. 2), by others to *Christian* customs ("it applies to the putting on of new—at a later time white—garments after baptism," Beza). The latter idea is especially to be set aside, because the custom concerned cannot be shown to have existed in *apostolic* times; at any rate, it has only originated from the N. T. idea of the putting on of the new man, and is its emblematic representation.

[1] Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 572. See on Rom. xiii. 14.

[2] Comp. Luther, 1538.

[3] Comp. Rom. viii. 29.

[4] Hom. *Od.* vii. 96; Schaefer, *ad Bos.* p. 51; Kühner, II. § 618.

[5] 1 Cor. vi. 5, and frequently in Greek authors, as Xen. *Anab.* v. 3. 11; Herod. vii. 112.

[6] Comp. Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 591.

statement, applying to the *readers*, is still continued ; therefore Hofmann is wrong, although consistent with his erroneous interpretation of the second person in ver. 26 f., in taking ἔνι as *general:* "*in Christ*," or "*now since faith has come*," on the ground that ἐν ὑμῖν is not added (which was obvious of itself from the context).[1] — ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ] Comp. Matt. xix. 4. The relation here is conceived otherwise than in the previous οὐκ . . . οὐδὲ, namely : there are not *male and female*, two sexes ; so that the negative is not to be supplied after καὶ.[2] — πάντες γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] Proof from the relation cancelling these distinctions, which is now constituted : *For ye all are one*, ye form a single moral person ; so that now those distinctions of individuals outside of Christianity appear as non-existent, completely merged in that higher unity to which ye are all raised in virtue of your fellowship of life with Christ. This is the εἷς καινὸς ἄνθρωπος, Eph. ii. 15. Observe the emphatic πάντες as in ver. 26, and ὅσοι in ver. 27. — ἐν Χριστῷ 'Ιησοῦ] Definition of εἷς ἐστε. They are one, namely, not absolutely, but in the definite sense of their relation as Christians, inasmuch as this unity is causally dependent on Christ, to whom they all belong and live (ii. 20 ; 2 Cor. v. 15 f. ; Rom. xiv. 8).[3]

Ver. 29. *But by your thus belonging to Christ ye are also Abraham's posterity :* for Christ is indeed the σπέρμα 'Αβ, "seed of Abraham" (ver. 16), and, since ye have entered into the relation *of Christ*, ye must consequently have a share in *the same* state, and must likewise be Abraham's σπέρμα, "seed ;" with which in conformity to the promise is combined the result, that ye are *heirs*, that is, that ye, just like heirs who have come into the possession of the property belonging to them, have as your own the salvation of the Messianic kingdom promised to Abraham and his seed (the realization of which is impending). — δέ] drawing a further inference, so that, after the explanation contained in ver. 28, εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ in point of fact resumes the Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε of ver. 27. The emphatic ὑμεῖς has as its background of contrast the *natural descendants of Abraham*, who as such do not belong to Christ and therefore are not Abraham's σπέρμα. — τοῦ 'Αβρ.] correlative to Χριστοῦ, and emphatically prefixed. Ye are *Abraham's seed*, because *Christ* is so (ver. 16), whose position has become yours (ver. 27).[4] — κατ' ἐπαγγ.] for τῷ Αβρ. ἐῤῥήθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, ver. 16. It is true that this σπέρμα in ver. 16 is *Christ :* but Christians have put on Christ (ver. 27), and are altogether one in Christ (ver. 28) ; thus the κατ' ἐπαγγ. (*in conformity with promise*) finds its justification. But the *emphasis* is laid, not on κατ' ἐπαγγ. as contrasted with κατὰ νόμον,[5] or with *another* order of heirs,[6] or with *natural* inheritance (Reithmayr), but on κληρονόμοι, which forms the link of connection with the matter that follows in ch. iv., and both here and at iv. 7 constitutes the important key-stone of the argument. This κληρονόμοι is the *triumph* of the whole, accompanied with the seal of *divine certainty* by means of κατ' ἐπαγγ. ; the two together forming the final death-blow to the Judaistic opponents, which comes in all the more forcibly without καί (see critical notes). The alleged contrast was obvious of itself long before in the words *σπέρμα τοῦ Ἀβρ.* (comp. ver. 18). The article was no more requisite than in ver. 18. — *κληρονόμοι*] The connection with the sequel shows, that the sense of *heir* is intended here. Τοῦ Ἀβρ. is not, however, to be again supplied to *κληρονόμοι*, as might be inferred from *σπέρμα*; but, without supplying a genitive of the person inherited from, we have to think of the *κληρονομία* of the *Messianic salvation.*[1] Against the supplying of *τοῦ* Ἀβρ. we may decisively urge not only the sequel, in which nothing whatever is said of any inheriting from *Abraham*, but also *κατ' ἐπαγγ.* For if Paul had wished to express the idea that Christians as the children of Abraham were also the heirs *of Abraham*, the *κατ' ἐπαγγ.* would have been inappropriate; because the promise (ver. 16) had announced the heirship of the Messianic kingdom to Abraham *and* his seed, but had not announced this heirship in the first instance to Abraham, and then announced to his seed in their turn that they should be *Abraham's* heirs.

---

[1] As to the idea generally, comp. Col. iii. 11 ; Rom. x. 12 ; 1 Cor. xii. 13.

[2] Bornemann, *ad Act.* xv. 1.

[3] See Col. iii. 11.

[4] Comp. Theodoret and Theophylact.

[5] Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, Wieseler.

[6] Hofmann.

Notes by American Editor.

XLII. Ver. 1. *ἐν ὑμῖν.*

On the other hand, the interpretation of *ἐν ὑμῖν* as "in your hearts," is just as inconsistent with *κατ' ὀφθαλμὸυς*, and there seems to be no satisfactory ground for deserting the ordinary classical meaning of *προγράφειν* as *palam scribere* (Sieffert). "Not only does this meaning harmonize best with the prominent and purely local *κατ' ὀφθαλμόυς* (compare *κατ' ὄμματα*, Soph. *Antiq.* 756), but also best illustrates the peculiar and suggestive *ἐβάσκανεν*, which thus gains great force and point, 'who could have bewitched you by his gaze, when you had only to fix your eyes on Christ to escape the fascination.' Comp. Numb. xxi. 9" (Ellicott).

XLIII. Ver. 4. *εἴγε.*

Sieffert notes that the *εἴγε* may have either a positive or contingent force, like the Latin *siquidem*, viz., either "*as indeed*" or "*if indeed.*" The connection (ver. 5) requires the latter, not as indicating a possibility of improvement, but the possibility that the readers had not yet fully reached the dreaded extreme. Eadie quotes the Syriac as: "And I would that it were vain."

XLIV. Ver. 6. *ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.*

"The apostle is speaking of faith, not as it is a quality inhering in us (for in that respect it does not justify, since it is obedience to only one commandment, is imperfect and long already due), but as it apprehends the redemption of Christ. . . . Scripture not only asserts that faith is accounted to us for righteousness, but also that Christ 'is our righteousness,' Jer. xxiii. 6, xxxiii. 16; in Him 'we have righteousness,' Is. xlv. 24; 'who of God is made unto us righteousness,' 1 Cor. i. 30; 'in Him we are made the righteousness of God,'

---

[1] Comp. Rom. viii. 17.

2 Cor. v. 21. Since, therefore, Christ and faith are said to be at the same time our righteousness, the consequence is that faith is and is called our righteousness, because it apprehends Christ's righteousness and makes it ours" (Gerhard's *Loci Theologici*, vii. 262).

XLV. Ver. 8. *ἐνευλογηθήσονται.*

Sieffert argues at length that Meyer's statement, instead of identifying the blessing with justification, should have simply named the latter as the necessary precondition of the former, which with Bähr he regards as "the life communicated by the spirit." The two are, however, so closely joined that Meyer really affirms no substantial error.

XLVI. Ver. 16. *τῷ σπέρματι.*

Better Eadie: "The apostle's argument is that the singular *σπέρμα* signifies what the plural *σπέρματα* could not have suggested. . . . It is true that *σπέρμα* may have a plural signification, as in Rom. iv. 18, ix. 7. . . . In the promise made to Abraham, however, the singular term is not a collective unity, but has an impersonal sense which no plural form could have borne. The singular form thus gives ground to the interpretation which he advances. The Septuagint had already given a similar personal meaning to *σπέρμα* — *αὐτός σου τηφήσει κεφαλήν*, Gen. iii. 15. That seed is Christ—not Jesus in individual humanity, but the Messiah so promised." Lightfoot: "He is not laying stress on the particular word used, but on the fact that a singular noun of some kind, a collective term is employed, where *τὰ τέκνα* or *δι' ἀπόγονοι*, for instance, might have been substituted."

XLVII. Ver. 19. *τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν.*

We see no inconsistency in such combination. The argument of the apostle is: The law, far from being a means whereby the Spirit and His gracious comfort are received (ver. 2), is, on the contrary, simply one whereby the abyss of sin within man becomes manifest in outward acts. Man's state is sin. The law becomes the occasion for the expression of this state in transgression. So the law is both the revealer of sin (*original*) and the occasion for sin (*actual*). Its influence is to bring the deep-seated corruption to the surface, and evoke the symptoms that show its real nature. The rod held before the serpent at once provokes its bite, and reveals its nature. This is hinted at even by the remark of Meyer: "Previously there were sins, but no transgressions."

XLVIII. Ver. 19. *δι' ἀγγέλων.*

Keil and Delitzsch (commentary on Deuteronomy), on the contrary, find this in the Hebrew text: "The Lord came not only from Sinai, but from heaven, '*out of holy myriads*,' *i.e.*, out of the midst of the thousands of holy angels who surround His throne (1 Kings xxii. 19; Job i. 6; Dan. vii. 10), and who are introduced in Gen. xxviii. 12 as His holy servants, and in Gen. xxxii. 2, 3, as the hosts of God, and form the assembly of the holy ones around His throne (Ps. lxxxix. 6, 8; cf. Ps. lxviii. 18; Zech. xiv. 5; Matt. xxvi. 53; Heb. xii. 22; Rev. v. 11, vii. 11)."

XLIX. Ver. 19. *ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου.*

We cannot appreciate the distinction made by de Wette, Sieffert, and others between the promise and the gospel, but recall the definition of Melanchthon in the Apology : "The gospel, which is properly the promise of the remission of sins" (Mueller, p. 94, § 43). With this exception, we regard the argument conclusive that the apostle is actually setting forth the superiority of the gospel or promise to the law. The ministration of angels, indeed, exhibited the glory of the law, which is also made manifest by Heb. xii. 18–29, wherein its inferiority is nevertheless set forth. Sieffert's answer to Meyer is briefly : 1. With reference to the mention of angels, it is in general correct that all manifestations and activity of angels are regarded as majestic and glorifying, yet that this is only the case because purely natural occurrences and purely natural modes of working form the antithesis, as contrasted with which the appearance of angels is an indication of divine working. 2. The word *μεσίτης*, applied, it is true, to Christ in 1 Tim. ii. 5, and which even in profane writers varies greatly in its meaning, has not, when used with respect to Christ, the specific force of one who interposes between two contracting parties. In this connection, as not in 1 Tim. ii. 5, the weakness and not the glory of the law is indicated by the *μεσίτης*. The difference in Christ's case is dependent on the person that becomes the *μεσίτης*. 3. It is shown that this position is not in violation of the argument. The entire passage, chap. iii. 6, iv. 7, is intended to prove the incorrectness of the Jewish position that the law stands in direct and positive relations to the divine plan of salvation, but, on the contrary, that it has only a negative relation and preparatory validity, that it does not correspond to the absolute, but only to the conditioned will of God. This is what is stated in concise and pointed form in ver. 20. A glorying of the law here would be highly out of place.

Lightfoot really solves the difficulty involved when he finds in the *μεσίτης* an argument for our Lord's divinity, "otherwise he would have been a mediator in the same sense as" (here) "Moses was a mediator."

L. Ver. 20. Entire verse.

The interpretation of Sieffert not only deserves attention, but seems very applicable : "The law is inferior to the promise, as its mediator, Moses, belongs not to God alone, but at the same time to Him and the people of Israel. According to the entire connection, this can mean only the same as already vv. 15-18 was indicated, that the law as a contract made between God and the people, whose validity depends upon what is done by the people of Israel, corresponds only to the conditioned will of God, but cannot be, as the autonomously given promise, an adequate expression of God's absolute will, of His eternally valid decree of salvation." So Sanday : "Therefore, the promise is not a contract ; and resting on God it is indefeasible." The argument of the succeeding verse then becomes : "If the law given through a mediator like this belongs not to God alone, and is not an adequate expression of the absolute will of God to save, is then perhaps the law contrary to the promises of God ?" (Sieffert).

LI. Ver. 22. *ἐδὸθη νόμος.*

Not "on account of faith in Christ," *um des Glaubens an Christum willen*, but "on account of Christ through faith," *um Christus willen durch den Glauben*, *propter Christum perfidem* (Augsburg Confession, Art. iv.), faith being only the instrumental and Christ the meritorious cause.

LII. Ver. 24. *παιδαγωγὸς ἐις χριστού.*

Yet even though this specific application be surrendered, the generic remains, viz., that the care of the pedagogue ends when that of a higher power begins. "Horace notes as a peculiar advantage of his own, that his father himself had taken the place of pedagogue to him, Sat., Lib. I., vi. 81, 82" (Sanday). If, however, the application of reconciliation is by the teaching of the gospel (Rom. x. 8, 9, 14), is there any inconsistency in regarding Christ in this verse as both teacher and reconciler?

CHAPTER IV.

Ver. 6. *ἡμῶν*] Elz. has *ὑμῶν*, against ℵ A B C D* F G, and many of the Fathers, after the foregoing *ἐστέ*. — Ver. 7. *κληρονόμος*] Elz. and Scholz add *Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ*. There are many variations, among which *κληρ. διὰ Θεοῦ* has most external attestation, viz., A B C* ℵ*, Copt. Vulg. Boern. Clem. Bas. Cyr. Didym. Ambr. Ambrosiast. Pel. ; so Lachm., Schott, Tisch. The Recepta *κληρ. Θευῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ* is defended by C. F. A. Fritzsche in *Fritzschiorum Opusc.* p. 148, and Reiche ; whilst Rinck, *Lucubr. crit.* p. 175, and Usteri, hold only *κληρ. διὰ Χριστοῦ* as genuine, following Marian.** Jerome (238, lect. 19, have *κληρ. διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*) ; Griesb. and Rück., however, would read merely *κληρονόμος* (so 178 alone). Theophyl. Dial. c. Maced., and two min., have from Rom. viii. 17 *κληρ. μὲν Θεοῦ, συγκληρ. δὲ Χριστοῦ*. Amidst this great diversity, the much preponderating attestation of *κληρ. διὰ Θεοῦ* (in favor of which F G also range themselves with *κληρ. διὰ Θεόν*) is decisive ; so that the Recepta must be regarded as having arisen from a gloss, and the mere *κληρονόμος*, which has almost no attestation, as resulting from a clerical omission of *διὰ Θεοῦ*. — Ver. 8. *φύσει μή*] So A B C D* E ℵ, min., vss., Ath. Nyss. Bas. Cyr. Ambr. Jer. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. But Elz. Matth. Scholz, Schott, Reiche, have *μὴ φύσει*. Opposed to this is the decisive weight of the evidence just given, and the internal ground, that in *τοῖς μὴ φύσει οὖσι θεοῖς* might easily be found the entire non-existence of the heathen gods, which could not but be more satisfactory than our reading, leaving as this does to the gods reality in general, and only denying them actual *divinity*. The same cause probably induced the omission of *φύσει* in K, 117, Clar. Germ. codd. Lat. in Ambr. Ir. Victorin. Ambrosiast. — Ver. 14. *πειρασμόν μου τόν*] So Elz. Matth. Scholz, Tisch. [1859], Reiche, following D*** K L, many min., and a few vss. and Fathers. But A B D* F G ℵ*, 17, 39, 67*, Copt. Vulg. It. Cyr. Jer. Aug. Ambrosiast. Sedul., have *πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν* [C**, same, with addition of *τόν*]. Recommended by Mill. and Griesb., adopted by Lachm [Tisch. 1872]. And justly ; *ὑμῶν* not being understood, was either expunged (so C* ?, min., Syr. Erp. Arm. Bas. Theophyl. ; approved by Winer, Rück., Schott, Fritzsche), or amended by *μου τόν*. Comp. Wieseler. — Ver. 15. *τίς οὖν*] Grot., Lachm., Rück., Usteri, Ewald, Hofm. [Tisch. 1872] read *ποῦ οὖν*, which is indeed attested by A B C F G ℵ, min., Syr. Arr. Syr. p. (in the margin), Arm. Copt. Vulg. Boern. Dam. Jer. Pel., but by the explanations of Theodore of Mopsuestia (*τὸ οὖν τίς ἐνταῦθα ἀντὶ τοῦ ποῦ ὁ μακαρ.*), Theodoret, Theophyl., and Oecum., is pretty well shown to be an ancient interpretation. — The *ἦν* which follows is omitted in A B C L ℵ [P] min., Aeth. Damasc. Theophyl. Theodoret. ms. Expunged by Lachm. and Scholz, also Tisch. Rightly. According as *τίς* was understood either correctly as expressing quality, or as equivalent to *ποῦ*, either *ἦν* (D E K *et al.*) or *ἐστι* (115, Sedul. Jer.), or even *νῦν* (122, Erp.), was supplied. In Oecum. the reading *ἦν* is combined with the explanation *ποῦ* by recourse to the gloss : *νῦν γὰρ οὐχ ὁρῶ αὐτόν*. — *ἄν*] before *ἐδώκ.* [ℵ** D** E K] is wanting in A B C D* F G ℵ, 17, 47,

Dam. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. : a grammatical addition. — Ver. 17. ἐκκλεῖσαι ὑμᾶς] Elz. has ἐκκλ ἡμᾶς, which is found only in a very few min., was introduced into the text by Beza,[1] and must be looked upon as an unnecessary conjecture. — Ver. 18. τὸ ζηλοῦσθαι] A C and four min., Damasc. have ζηλοῦσθαι merely (so Lachm.), while B ℵ, and 17, 23, 39, Aeth. Vulg. Jer. Ambrosiast., read ζηλοῦσθε. The latter is an ancient error in transcribing, which involved the suppression of the article. The correct form ζηλοῦσθαι was restored, but the article, which seemed superfluous, was not recovered. — Ver. 21. ἀκούετε] D E F G, 10, 31, 80, Vulg. It. Sahid. Arm., and Fathers, have ἀναγινώσκετε. An ancient interpretation. — Ver. 24. δύο] Elz. has αἱ δύο [according to ℵ* and min.], against decisive testimony [ℵ*** A B C D E F G, etc.]. — Ver. 25. Ἄγαρ] is wanting in C F G ℵ, 17, 115, Aeth. Arm. Vulg. Goth. Boern. Cyr. Epiph. Damasc. Or. int. Ambrosiast. Jer. Aug. Pel. Sedul. Beda. Deleted by Lachm. [Bentley, Bengel] and Wieseler, condemned also by Hofmann, who refers [Fritzsche, Lightfoot and Tisch. 1872] Ἄγαρ to the Syriac Church, although it is attested by A B D E K L P, and most min., Chrys., and others. But instead of γάρ, A B D E, 37, 73, 80, lect. 40, Copt. Cyr. (once), have δέ. The juxtaposition of γὰρ Ἄγαρ led to the omission sometimes of the Ἄγαρ and sometimes of the γάρ. After the latter was omitted, in a part of the witnesses the connection that was wanting was restored by δέ ; just as in the case of several, mostly more recent authorities, instead of γάρ after δουλεύει, δέ has crept in (so Elz.), because the argument of the apostle was not understood. — συστοιχεῖ δέ] D* F G, Vulg. It. Goth., read ἡ συστοιχοῦσα ; D*, however, not having the article. A gloss, in order to exhibit the reference to Ἄγαρ in ver. 24. — Ver. 26. ἡμῶν] Elz. reads πάντων ἡμῶν ; Lachm. has bracketed πάντων. But it is wanting in B C* D E F G ℵ, some min., most vss., and many Fathers. Deleted by Tisch.; defended by Reiche. An amplifying addition [from Rom. iv. 16] involuntarily occasioned by the recollection of iii. 26, 28, and the thought of the multitude of the τέκνα (ver. 27). — Ver. 28. ἡμεῖς . . . ἐσμέν) Lachm. and Schott, also Tisch., read ὑμεῖς ἐστε, following B D* F G, some min., Sahid. Aeth. Ir. Victorin. Ambr. Tychon. Ambrosiast. Justly ; the first person was introduced on account of vv. 26 and 31. — Ver. 30. κληρονομήσῃ] Lach. [Tisch. 1872] reads κληρονομήσει, following B D E ℵ and Theophylact ; from the LXX. — Ver. 31. ἄρα] A C, 23, 57, Copt. Cyr. Damasc. Jer. Aug., have ἡμεῖς δέ ; B D* E ℵ, 67**, Cyr. Marcion, read διό. The latter is (with Lachm. and Tisch.) to be preferred ; for ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀδελφοί is evidently a mechanical repetition of ver. 28 (Rec.), and ἄρα is too feebly attested (F G, Theodoret, have ἄρα οὖν).

CONTENTS.—*Further discussion of the* κληρονόμους εἶναι (iii. 29), as a privilege which could not have been introduced *before* Christ, while the period of nonage lasted, but was *first* introduced *by means of* Christ and Christianity at the time appointed by God, when the earlier servile relation was changed into that of sonship (vv. 1–7). After Paul has expressed his surprise at the apostasy of his readers, and his anxiety lest he may have labored among them in vain (vv. 8–11), he entreats them to become like to him, and supports this entreaty by a sorrowful remembrance of the abounding love which they had manifested to him on his first visit, but which appeared to have been converted into enmity (vv. 12–16). He warns them against the selfish zeal with which the pseudo-apostles courted them (ver. 17), while at the same time he reproves their fickleness (ver. 18), and expresses the wish that he were now present with them, in order to regain, by an altered mode of speaking to them, their lost confidence (vv. 18–20). Lastly, he refutes the tendency to legalism from the law itself, namely, by an allegorical interpretation of the account that Abraham had two sons, one by the bondwoman, and one by the free woman (vv. 21–30), and then lays down the proposition that Christians are children of the free woman, which forms the groundwork of the exhortations and warnings that follow in ch. v. (ver. 31).

---

[1] Beza himself allows that ὑμᾶς stands in *all* the codd. (in the fifth edition he adds: *Latin*), but considers that the *sense* requires ἡμᾶς.

Ver. 1. λέγω δέ] Comp. iii. 17, v. 16; Rom. xv. 8; 1 Cor. i. 12: *now I mean*, in reference to this κληρονομία brought in through Christ, the idea of which I have now more exactly to illustrate to you as for the first time realized in Christ. This illustration is derived by Paul from a comparison of the pre-Christian period to the period of the servile, slave-like childhood of the heir-apparent.—ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον] As in Rom. vii. 1; 1 Cor. vii. 39.—ὁ κληρονόμος] The article as in ὁ μεσίτης, iii. 20: the heir in any given case. Κληρ. is, however, to be conceived here, as in Matt. xxi. 38, as the heir of the father's goods, who is not yet in actual personal possession, but *de jure*—the *heir apparent*, whose father is *still alive*. So Cameron, Neubour (*Bibl. Brem.* v. p. 40), Wolf, Baumgarten, Semler, Michaelis, and many others, including Winer, Schott, Wieseler, Reithmayr. But Rückert, Studer (in Usteri), Olshausen (undecided), Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Hofmann, following Chrysostom, Theodoret, and most of the older expositors, conceive the heir as one *whose father is dead*. Incorrectly, on account of ver. 2; for the duration of the guardianship (in which sense ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους, ver. 2, must then be understood) could not have been determined by the *will of the father*,[1] but would have depended on the *law*.[2] Hofmann thinks, indeed, that the point whether the father was bound by a law of majority is not taken into account, but only the fact, that it is *the father himself* who has made arrangements respecting his heir. But in this view the προθεσμία, *as prescribed by the father*, would be entirely illusory; the notice would be absurd, because the προθεσμία would be not τοῦ πατρός, but τοῦ νόμου.—νήπιος] still in boyhood.[3] "Imberbis juvenis tandem custode remoto gaudet equis," "the beardless youth, his guardian at length removed, delights in horses." [Horace, *Ars. Poetica*, 161, 162], etc., Virg. *Aen.* ix. 649. [See Note LIII., p. 212.] Quite in opposition to the context, Chrysostom and Oecumenius refer it to *mental* immaturity.[4]—οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου] because he is not *sui juris*.[5]—κύριος πάντων ὤν] *although he is lord of all*, namely, *de jure*, *in eventum*, "by right," "eventually," as the *heir-*

---

[1] Baumgarten-Crusius, indeed, appeals to the proof adduced by Göttling (*Gesch. d. Röm. Staatsverf.* pp. 109, 517), that Gaius, I. 55. 65, 189, comp. Caes. *Bell. Gall.* vi. 19, mentions the existence of a higher grade of the *patria potestas* among the Galatians. But in this way it is by no means shown that the time of the majority was, after the *death* of the father, dependent on the settlement which he had previously made.

[2] Hermann, *Staatsalterth.* § 121.

[3] Comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 11.

[4] Rom. ii. 20; Hom. *Il* v. 406, xvi. 46, *et al.*

[5] Comp. Liban. *in Chiis*, p. 11 D, in Wetstein.

apparent of all the father's goods. Consequently neither this nor the preceding point is inconsistent with the hypothesis that the father is still alive.[1] Comp. Luke xvi. 31. — The κληρονόμος νήπιος represents, not the people of *Israel;* [2] but, according to the connection with iii. 29 (comp. iv. 3), *the Christians as a body*, regarded in their earlier *pre-Christian* condition. In this condition, whether Jewish or Gentile, they were the *heir-apparent*, according to the idea of the divine predestination (Rom. viii. 28 ff.; Eph. i. 11; John xi. 52), in virtue of which they were ordained to be the Israel of God (vi. 16), the true σπέρμα of Abraham.

Ver. 2. Ἐπίτροπος means here not *guardian*,[3] as it is explained by all who look upon the father as dead,[4] but *overseer*, *governor*, and that without any more special definition;[5] it is neither therefore to be taken [6] as synonymous with οἰκονόμος (which would give a double designation without ground for it), nor as equivalent to παιδαγωγός (which would be an arbitrary limitation). The term denotes *any one*, to whose governorship the boy is assigned by the father in the arrangement which has been made of the family affairs; and from this category are then specially singled out the οἰκονόμοι, the superior slaves appointed as managers of the household and property (Luke xvi. 1), on whom the νήπιος was dependent in respect to money and other outward wants. — ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός] *Until the appointed time of the father*, until the term, which the father has fixed upon for releasing his son from this state of dependence. ἡ προθεσμία, *tempus praestitutum*, does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., but is frequent in classical authors.[7]

Ver. 3. Ἡμεῖς] embraces Christians generally, the *Jewish and Gentile Christians together.* In favor of this view we may decisively urge, (1) the sense of στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (see below); (2) ver. 5, where the first ἵνα applies to the Jewish Christians, but the second, reverting to the first person, applies to Christians generally, because the address to the readers which follows in ver. 6 represents these as a whole, and not merely the Jewish Christians among them, as included in the preceding ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν; lastly, (3) that the οὐκέτι and τότε, said of the Galatians in vv. 7 and 8, point back to the state of slavery of the ἡμεῖς in ver. 3. Therefore ἡμεῖς is not to be understood as referring either *merely* to the *Jewish Christians*;[8] or—as Hofmann in consistency with his erroneous reference of iii. 29 to the Gentile readers holds—to "the Old Testament church of God, which has now passed over into the New Testament church;" or to the Jewish Christians *pre-eminently*;[9] or, lastly, even to the *Gentile Christians* alone.[10] — ὅτε ἦμεν νήπιοι] characterizes, in terms of the prevailing comparison, the *pre-Christian con-*

---

[1] As Hofmann and others have objected.

[2] Wieseler.

[3] ὀρφανῶν ἐπίτροπος, Plat. *Legg.* p. 766 C; Dem. 988. 2; Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 40; 2 Macc. xi. 1, xiii. 2, xiv. 2; comp. also the rabbinical אפוטרופוס in Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 743 f.

[4] See, however, on ver. 1.

[5] Herod. i. 108; Pind. *Ol.* i. 171; Dem. 819. 17; Xen. *Oec.* 21. 9; and very frequently in classical authors.

[6] As in Matt. xx. 8; Luke viii. 3.

[7] See Wetstein; also Jacobs, *Ach. Tat.* p. 440.

[8] Chrysostom and most expositors, including Grotius, Estius, Morus, Flatt, Usteri, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Wieseler.

[9] Koppe, Rückert, Matthies, Olshausen.

[10] Augustine.

dition, which, in relation to the Christian condition of the same persons, was their *age of boyhood*. Elsewhere Paul has represented the condition of the Christians *before* the Parousia, in comparison with their state *after* the Parousia, as a time of boyhood.[1] — *ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἦμεν δεδουλ.*] corresponds, as application, to the *οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου . . . ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους ἐστὶ καὶ οἰκον.* The word *στοιχεῖον*—which denotes primarily a stake or peg standing in a row, then a *letter* of the alphabet,[2] then, like *ἀρχή*, *element*[3] —means here at all events *element*,[4] which signification has developed itself from the idea of a *letter*, inasmuch as a word is a series of the letters which form it.[5] In itself, however, it might be used either in the *physical* sense of *elementary substances*, which Plato[6] calls also γένη,[7] as it frequently occurs in Greek authors applied to the so-called *four elements*,[8] or in the *intellectual* sense of *rudimenta*, "rudiments," *first principles*.[9] In the latter sense the verb στοιχειοῦν was used to signify the instruction given to catechumens.[10] In the *physical* sense—in which it is used by later Greek authors for designating the *stars*[11] — it was understood by most of the Fathers: either as by Augustine,[12] who thought of the Gentile adoration of the heavenly bodies and of other nature-worship; or as by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Ambrose, Pelagius, who referred it to the Jewish observance of new moons, feasts, and Sabbaths, which was regulated by the course of the moon and sun. So, combining the Gentile and Jewish cultus, Hilgenfeld, p. 66,[13] who ascribes to the apostle the heterogeneous idea of "sidereal powers of heaven," that is, of the stars as powerful animated beings;[14] and Caspari,[15] in whose view Paul is supposed to have placed Mosaism in the category of star and nature worship; and likewise Reithmayr, although without such extravagances. But because the expression is applicable neither merely to the circumstances of the heathen, nor merely to those of the Jewish, cultus (see, on the contrary, vv. 8–10),—to the latter of which it is in the physical sense not at all suitable, for the Jewish celebrations of days and the like were by no means a star-worship or other (possibly unconscious) worship *of nature*, under which man would have been in bondage, but were an imperfect worship *of God*—and because the context suggests nothing else than the contrast between the imperfect and the perfect religion, as well as also on account of the correlation to νήπιοι, the physical sense of στοιχεῖον is altogether to be rejected.[1] Besides, it would be difficult to perceive why Paul, if he had thought of the stars, should not have written τοῦ οὐρανοῦ instead of τοῦ κόσμου. Hence Jerome,[2] Erasmus, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, and most of the later expositors, though with various modifications, have correctly adhered to the sense *rudimenta disciplinae*, "rudiments of discipline," which alone corresponds to the notion of the νηπιότης (for the *age of childhood* does not get beyond *first principles*). The στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου are the *elements of non-Christian humanity* (κόσμος; see 1 Cor. vi. 2, xi. 32, *et al.*), that is, the elementary things, the immature beginnings of religion, which occupy the minds of those who are still without the pale of Christianity. Not having attained to the perfect religion, the κόσμος has still to do with the religious elementary state, to which it is in bondage, as in the position of a servant. Rudiments of this sort are expressly mentioned in ver. 10; hence we must understand the expression, not in a onesided fashion as the elementary *knowledge*, the beginnings of religious *perception* in the non-Christian world[3]—with which neither the idea of the relation as *slavery*, nor the inclusion of the Jewish and Gentile worships under one category would harmonize—but as the *rudimenta ritualia*, the *ceremonial character of Judaism and heathenism*,[4] with which, however, is also combined the corresponding imperfection of religious knowledge.[1] Against the explanation, "*religious* elementary things of the world," the objection has been made, that this idea is suitable neither to Judaism, in so far as the latter was a divine revelation, nor even to heathenism, which, according to Paul, is something foreign to religion; see especially Neander. But the latter part of the objection is erroneous (Acts xvii. 22, 23); and the former part is disposed of when—in the light of the pretensions put forth by the apostle's opponents, which were chiefly based on the ceremonial side of the law—we take into account the relative character of the idea *rudimenta*, "rudiments," according to which Judaism, when compared with Christianity as the absolute religion, may, although a divine institution, yet be included under the notion of στοιχεῖα, because destined only for the νήπιοι and serving a transitory propaedeutic purpose.[2] Most of the older expositors, as also Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette (with many various and mistaken interpretations of κόσμος; see Wolf and Rückert *in loc.*), have referred the expression *merely* to *Judaism*,[3] whilst Koppe and Schott only allow the analogous nature of *ethnicism* to be included incidentally; but, besides what has been above remarked on ἡμεῖς, these views are at variance with the idea of τοῦ κόσμου. This idea is, at all events, too *wide* to suit the *law*, which was given to the *people of Israel* only; whether it be taken as applying to *mankind generally* (de Wette, Wieseler), or to the *unbelieving portion of mankind*, in contrast to the ἅγιοι in a Christian sense.[4] Certainly it might appear unwise (see especially Wieseler) that Paul should have placed Judaism and heathenism in one category. But, in point of fact, he has to deal with *Judaistic* seductions occurring in churches chiefly *Gentile*-Christian: he might therefore, with the view of more effectually warning them and putting them to shame, so designate the condition of bondage to which by these seductions they were induced to revert, as to comprehend it in the same category with the *heathen* cultus, from the bondage of which they had been not long before liberated by Christianity. According to Hofmann, the στοιχεῖα τ. κόσμου are contrasted with the promise given to Abraham of the κληρονομία κόσμου, Rom. iv. 13. He supposes that out of the destruction of the *material elements of the present world* (2 Pet. iii. 10) the οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα (Heb. ii. 5) will arise, and that this will derive its nature and character from the *Spirit*, the communication of which is the beginning of the fulfilment of that promise. Israel, however, has been in bondage under the *material elements* of which the present world is composed, *inasmuch as in what it did and what it left undone it was subject to stringent*

---

[1] See 1 Cor. xiii. 11; Eph. iv. 13.

[2] Plat. *Theaet.* p. 202 E; Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1. 1; Arist. *Poet.* 20. 2; Lucian, *Jud. voc.* 12.

[3] See Rudolph on *Ocell.* p. 402 ff.

[4] A point on which almost all expositors agree. Yet Luther, 1519, following the precedent of Tertull. *c. Marc.* v. 4, adopted the signification of *letters*: "pro ipsis literis legis, quibus lex constat. . . . *Mundi* autem vocat, quod sint de iis rebus, quae in mundo sunt," "for the very letters of the law, in which the law consists . . . Moreover, he says 'of the world,' because they are of the things which are in the world." So also in 1524, and at least to a similar effect in 1538. More recently Michaelis has also explained it as *letters*; holding that the acts of the Levitical law were intended, because, taken as a whole, they had preached the gospel by anticipation. Similarly Nösselt, *Opusc.* II. p 209, takes στοιχεῖα as *signs* (Arist. *Eccl.* 652, where it is used for the shadow of the plate on the sun-dial; comp. Lucian, *Gall.* 9, *Cronos.* 17), holding that the Jewish ceremonies are thus named because they prefigured the future Christian worship. These views are all erroneous, because the expression στοιχεῖα τ. κόσμου applies also to *Gentile* habits.

[5] Walz, *Rhetor.* VI. p. 110.

[6] Ruhnk. *ad Tim* p. 283.

[7] 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12; Wisd. vii. 17, xix. 18; 4 Macc. xii. 13; Plat. *Tim.* p. 48 B, 56 B, *Polit.* p. 278 C; Philo, *de Opif. m.* p. 7, 11, *Cherub.* p. 162; Clem. *Hom.* x. 9.

[8] Comp. Suidas, *s.v.*

[9] Heb. v. 12; Plut. *de pueror. educ.* 16; Isocr. p. 18 A; Nicol. *ap. Stob.* xiv. 7. 31; see Wetstein.

[10] *Constitt. ap.* vi. 18. 1, vii. 25. 2. Comp. our expression the *A*, *B*, *C* of an art or science. Comp. generally, Schaubach, *Commentat. quid στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in N. T. sibi velint*, Meining. 1862.

[11] Diog. L. vi. 102; Man. iv. 624; Eustath. *Od.* p. 1671, 53.

[12] *De civ. D.* iv. 11.

[13] Comp. in his *Zeitschr.* 1858, p. 99; 1866, p. 314.

[14] Comp. Baur and Holsten.

[15] In the *Strassb. Beitr.* 1854, p. 206 ff.

---

[1] With strange arbitrariness Schulthess (*Engelwelt*, pp. 113, 129) has recently anticipated Hilgenfeld in re-asserting this sense; holding that the *stars* are meant, but that Paul is glancing at the Jewish *ministry of angels* (Job xxxviii. 7 (!)). More thoroughly Schneckenburger (in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1848, p. 445 ff.) has again defended the physical reference (*elements of the visible world*). Comp. Holsten, *z. Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 323. In this interpretation the law must be excepted (as is done by Holsten) from the στοιχεῖα,—an exception which is forbidden by the whole connection with ch. iii., and is also inconsistent with the concrete instances in vv. 8 and 10; see above. Neander also—who, however, introduces the idea of the *sensuous forms of religion*—would retain the physical reference, which is decidedly assumed by Lipsius (*Rechtfertigungsl.* p. 83), who specially commends the interpretation of Hilgenfeld; whilst Messner (*Lehre d. Ap.* p. 226) agrees in substance with Neander, holding that δεδουλ. ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου is "the dependence of the religious consciousness on the earthly, sensuous, perishable things, of which this earthly κόσμος, as to its fundamental elements, consists. But why, then, the restriction "as to its *fundamental elements*"? And the idea of perishableness is *imported*. Ewald understands by it the *elements of the world*, into the whole of which life must be brought through the spirit, and unity and meaning through God; it comprehends the Jewish observances as to meats and days, as well as the heathen star-worship. Yet how unsuited to popular apprehension (as pertaining to natural philosophy) would the whole expression thus be! an enigmatic designation for the heathen worship, and an unsuitable one for the Jewish cultus, which is based on divine precept. As to the way in which Hofmann understands the material elements of the world, see the sequel.

[2] Also τινές in Theophylact, and Gennadius in Oecumenius, p. 747 D.

[3] Comp. Kienlen, in the *Strassb. Beitr.* II. p. 133 ff.

[4] Comp. Schaubach, *l.c.* p. 9 ff.

---

[1] Comp. Col. ii. 8, 20.

[2] Comp. Baur, *Paulus*, II. p. 222, ed. 2; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 289; also Ritschl, *altkath. K.* p. 73.

[3] The *law* "as a means of training calculated only for the age of childhood," de Wette, who is followed by Wieseler.

[4] Olshausen, feeling the difficulty which the idea of κόσμος puts in the way of the reference to Judaism, hits upon the arbitrary expedient of taking the expression to apply to the merely external and literal *way of apprehending* the O. T., which confines itself merely to the actions, without considering the idea involved in them. "This was the procedure of the Judaists, and in this shape the Old Test. appeared not merely as the *beginning* of divine life, but also as given over to the *world*," etc.

laws, which had reference to the world in its existing materiality; it had to conform itself to the things of this *corporeal* world, whilst the promise had been made to it that it should be lord of *all things*. Apart from the erroneous application of ἡμεῖς (see above), every essential point in this interpretation is *gratuitously introduced*. In particular, the contrast on which it is based—namely, that of the new world of the αἰών which is to come—is utterly foreign not only to the whole context, but even to the words themselves; for, if Paul had had this contrast in view, he must, in order not to leave his readers wholly without a hint of it, have at least added a τούτου[1] to τοῦ κόσμου.[2] It is, moreover, incorrect to discover in the στοιχεῖα the opposite of the future world, so far as the latter has its nature from the *Spirit*. The world of the αἰὼν μέλλων, as the new heaven and the new earth (2 Pet. iii. 13), must likewise be corporeally material, and must have its στοιχεῖα, although the σχῆμα of the old world will have passed away.[3] — ἤμεν δεδουλωμ.] may be taken either together, or separately; the latter is to be preferred, because it corresponds more emphatically to the οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου (ver. 1) and the ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους ἐστι (in ver. 2): *we were enslaved ones.*

Ver. 4. Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθε τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου] corresponds to the ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμ. τοῦ πατρ. (ver. 2). The time appointed by God, which was to elapse until the appearance of Christ (ὁ χρόνος)—consequently the pre-Messianic period—is conceived as a measure which was not yet full, so long as this period had not wholly elapsed.[4] Hence τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου is: *that moment of time, through which the measure of time just mentioned became full.*[5] — On what *historical conditions* Paul conceived that counsel as to the fulness of time to depend[6] cannot, after his view of the destination of the law which intervened between the promise and its fulfilment (iii. 19, 24; Rom. v. 20), remain doubtful. Theophylact takes in substance the right view. The need had reached its height. Comp. Chrysostom, *ad Eph.* i. 10: ὅτε μάλιστα ἔμελλον ἀπόλλυσθαι, τότε διεσώθησαν, "when they were just about to be destroyed, they were saved." Without due ground Baur perceives here[7] the idea that Christianity proceeded from a principle *inherent in humanity*, namely, from the advance of the mind to the freedom of self-consciousness. — ἐξαπέστειλεν] *He sent forth from Himself.* Ver. 6; Acts vii. 12, xi. 22, xvii. 14, *et al.;* Dem. 251. 5; Polyb. iii. 11. 1, iv. 26. 2, iv. 30. 1, and frequently. The expression presupposes the idea of the personal pre-existence of Christ,[8] and therewith at the same time His personal divine nature (Rom. viii. 3, 32; Phil. ii. 6; 2 Cor. viii. 9); so that *in reality* the apostle's idea coincides with the Johannean ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τ. Θεόν and Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, but is not to be reduced to the notion of "the ideal first man,"[1] whose human birth, on account of His pre-existence, is conceived by Paul as not without a certain Docetism.[2] This remark also applies against the view of Beyschlag referring it to the pre-existent *prototype* of man,[3] in connection with which the Messianic name of Son is supposed to be carried back from the historical to the pre-historical sphere. This is at variance with the express designation, as πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως (Col. i. 15), which likewise forbids us to say, with Hofmann: "*By the very fact*, that God has sent Him forth from Himself into the world, *He is the Son of God.*" According to Col. i. 15, He is, even before the creation, in the relation of *Son* to the Father, as *begotten* by Him,—a relation, therefore, which could not be dependent on the subsequent sending forth, or given for the first time *along with* the latter. —γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός] *so that He was born of a woman;* the relation of the aorist participle is the same as in Phil. ii. 7 f. The reading γεννώμενον—attested only by min., and otherwise feebly, although recommended by Erasmus, adopted by Matthias, and defended by Rinck—is a correct interpretation,[4] which also occurs at Rom. i. 3, in Codd. mentioned by Augustine. *Who* this γυνή was, every reader *knew;* we must not, however, say with Schott, following many of the older expositors, "de *virgine sponsa* dicitur," "it is said 'of the betrothed virgin;'"[5] but comp. Job xiv. 1; Matt. xi. 11. Nor is anything peculiar to be found in ἐκ;[6] on the contrary, ἐκ is quite the *usual* preposition to express the being born.[7] This very fact, that Christ, although the Son of God, whom God had sent forth from Himself, entered into this life as *man* (Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 21; Acts xvii. 31) and—just *as an ordinary man* enters into temporal life—as *one born of woman*, Paul wishes to bring into prominence as the mode of carrying out the divine counsel.[8] The supernatural *generation* which preceded the natural *birth* was not here in question; its mention would even have been at variance with the connection which points to Christ's humiliation: it is not, however, anywhere else expressly mentioned by the apostle, or certainly indicated as a consequence involved in his system (Weiss).[9] Nor is it to be inferred from ἐξαπέστειλεν, in connection with the designation of Him who was sent forth as the *Son*;[10] because, while it is assumed that as the Son of God He was already, before His incarnation, with God (ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν), the *mode* of His incarnation—*how He* was born κατὰ σάρκα ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυίδ[11]—is not defined—γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον] Luther: "made under the law ;" and so most expositors : *legi subjectum*, "subject to the law." But it is arbitrary to take *γενόμ.* here in another sense than before ;[1] and the vivid emphasis of the *twice-used* *γενόμ.* is thus lost. Hence Michaelis, Koppe, Matthies, Schott, de Wette, Lechler, rightly understand *γενόμ.* as *natum.* Thus also, in fact, "the beginning of an *εἶναι ὑπὸ νόμον*" (Hofmann) is expressed, and expressed indeed *more definitely.* Paul desires to represent the birth of the Son of God not merely as an ordinary *human* birth, but also as an ordinary *Jewish* birth ;[2] and he therefore says : "*born of a woman, born under the law*," so that He was subjected to circumcision and to all other ordinances of the law, like any other Jewish child. But God caused His Son to be born as an ordinary man and as an ordinary Israelite, because otherwise He could not have undergone death—either at all, or as One cursed by the law (iii. 13), which did not apply to those who were not Jews (Rom. i. 12)—and could not have rendered the curse of the law of none effect as regards those who were its subjects.[3] *For this reason*, and not merely on account of the contrast to *τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ*,[4] Paul has added *γενόμ. ἐκ γυν.*, *γεν. ὑπὸ νόμ.*, as a characteristic description of the humiliation into which God allowed His Son to enter. See the sequel. —With respect, moreover, to the *perfect obedience* of Christ *to the law*, it was a preliminary condition necessary for the redeeming power of His death (because otherwise the curse of the law would have affected *Him even on His own account*) ; but it is not that which is *imputed* for righteousness; on the contrary, this is purely *faith in the ἱλαστήριον*, "propitiation," *of His death.*[5] The doctrine of the Formula Concordiae as to the *imputation* of the *obedientia Christi activa*[6] is not borne out by the exegetical proof, of which our passage is alleged to form part ; but the atoning death of Christ is the culminating point of His obedience towards God (Rom. v. 19 ; Phil. ii. 8 ; 2 Cor. v. 21) [See Note LIV., p. 212 seq.], without the perfection of which He could not have accomplished the atonement ; and the form which this obedience assumed in Him, in so far as He was subject to the *law*, must have been that of legal obedience.[7]

---

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 31, i. 20, iii. 19; Eph. ii. 2.

[2] He does not add τούτου in Col. ii. 8, 20, just because the contrast suggested by Hofmann was far from his thoughts.

[3] Comp. on 1 Cor. vii. 31.

[4] Comp. Gen. xxix. 21; Mark i. 15; Luke xxi. 24; John vii. 8; Joseph. *Antt.* vi. 4. 1, *et al.*

[5] Comp. on Eph. i. 10, and Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 473.

[6] Theophylact: ὅτε πᾶν εἶδος κακίας διεξελθοῦσα ἡ φύσις ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη ἐδεῖτο θεραπείας, "when human nature, having experienced every form of evil, needed medical treatment." Baur: "when mankind was ripe for it;" de Wette: "conditioned by the need of certain preparations, or by the necessity of the religious development of mankind which had reached a certain point."

[7] See his *neut. Theol.* p. 173.

[8] See Räbiger, *Christol. Paul.* p. 16; Lechler, *apost. Zeit.* p. 50; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 316 ff.

---

[1] Hilgenfeld.

[2] See, on the contrary, Rom. i. 3; indeed, Paul throughout is the very opposite of Docetism.

[3] *Christol. d. N. T.* p. 220 ff.

[4] As to the meaning, but not as to the tense; see Phot. *Qu. Amphil.* 90.

[5] Comp. Augustine, *Serm.* 16 *de temp.;* Jerome, and others.

[6] "*ex semine matris* . . . non viri et mulieris coitu," "*of the seed of the mother* . . . not by the union of man and woman," Calvin; comp. Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Calovius, and others; Theophylact, following Basil, Jerome, and others: ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτῆς σῶμα λαβόντα.

[7] John iii. 6; Matt. i. 16; 1 Pet. i. 22, *et al.;* 3 Esr. iv. 16; 4 Macc. xiv. 14; frequently used also in classical authors with γίγνεσθαι.

[8] Comp. Rom. viii. 3; Phil. ii. 7.

[9] Comp. on Rom. i. 3.

[10] Hofmann, comp. also his *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 84.

[11] Rom. i. 3; comp. ix. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 8; Acts ii. 30.

Ver. 5. The object for which God sent forth His Son, and sent Him indeed *γενόμ. ἐκ γυναικ.*, *γενόμ. ὑπὸ νόμον.* — *τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον*] The Israelites are thus designated in systematic correspondence to the previous *γενόμ. ὑπὸ νόμον.*[8] — *ἐξαγοράσῃ*] Namely, as follows from *τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον*, *from the dominion of the law*, vv. 1–3 (in which its curse, iii. 11, is included), and that through His death, iii. 13. Erasmus well says : "dato pretio assereret in libertatem," "As the price had been given, he would claim for liberty." — *ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσ. ἀπολάβ.*] The aim of this redemption ; for of this negative benefit the *υἱοθεσία* was the immediate positive consequence. But Paul could not again express himself in the *third* person, because the *υἱοθεσία* had been imparted to the Gentiles also, whereas that redemption referred merely to the Jews; but now both, Jews and Gentiles, after having attained the υἱοθεσία no longer ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἦσαν δεδουλωμένοι (ver. 3): hence Paul, in the first person of the second sentence of purpose, speaks from the consciousness of the *common* faith which embraced both the *Jewish and the Gentile* portions of the Christian body, not merely from the Jewish-Christian consciousness, as Hofmann holds on account of ἐστέ in ver. 6.[1]—The υἱοθεσία is here, as it always is, *adoption*[2]— a meaning which is wrongly denied by Usteri, as the signification of the word *allows* no other interpretation, and the context *requires* no other. Previously not different from *slaves* (vv. 1–3), as they were in the state of νηπιότης, believers have now entered into the entirely different legal relation towards God of their being *adopted* by Him as children.[3] The divine *begetting* (to which Hofmann refers) is a *Johannean* view; see on John i. 12. In the *divine* economy of salvation the gracious gift of the υἱοθεσία was needed in order to attain the κληρονομία; while in the *human* economy, which serves as the figure, the heir-apparent becomes at length heir as a matter of course. Accordingly Paul has not *given up* (Wieseler) the figure on which ver. 1 ff. was based—a view at variance with the express application in ver. 3, and the uninterrupted continuation of the same in ver. 4; but he has merely had recourse to such a free *modification in the application*, as was suggested to him by the certainly partial difference between the real circumstances of the case and the figure set forth in vv. 1, 2.[4]—ἀπολάβ.] not: that we might *again* receive, as is the meaning of ἀπολαμβ. very often in Greek authors,[5] and in Luke xv. 27; for before Christ men never possessed the υἱοθεσία here referred to (although the *old* theocratic adoption of the *Jews* was never lost, Rom. ix. 4): hence Augustine and others are in error when they look back to the sonship that was lost in *Adam*. Nor must we assume[6] that, because the υἱοθεσία is promised, it is denoted by ἀπολάβ. as ὀφειλομένη,—a sense which is often conveyed by the context in Greek authors and also in the N.T.,[7] but not here, because it is not the υἱοθεσία expressly, but the κληρονομία,[8] which is the object of the promise. As little can we say, with Rückert and Schott, that the sonship is designated as *fruit* (ἀπο = *inde*) of the work of redemption, or, with Wieseler, as fruit of the *death* of Jesus apprehended by faith: for while it certainly *is* so in point of fact, the verb could not lead to it without some more precise indication in the text than that given by the mere ἐξαγορ. On the contrary, ἀπολάβ. simply denotes: *to take at the hands of* any one, *to receive*, as Luke xvi. 25; Plat. *Legg.* xii. p. 956 D, and very frequently in Greek authors.

---

[1] Viewed by itself, *γίνεσθαι ὑπό* with the *accusative*, in the sense *to be subject to*, is, in a linguistic point of view, quite as correct (1 Macc. x. 38 ; Thuc. i. 110. 1 ; Lucian. *Abdic.* 23) as with the *dative* (Herod. vii. 11 ; Xen. *Anab.* vii. 2. 3, vii. 7. 32 ; Thuc. vii. 64. 2).

[2] Comp. Heb. ii. 14–17.

[3] Comp. Rom. viii. 3 f. ; Heb. iii. 14 f.

[4] Schott.

[5] See on iii. 13 ; Rom. iv. 5, 24, v. 6 ff., *et al.*

[6] p. 685.

[7] Comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 130.

[8] Comp. iii. 25, iv. 21, v. 18 ; Rom. vi. 14.

Ver. 6. A confirmation of the reality of this reception of sonship from the *experience of the readers*; for the ἐστέ, which, after the foregoing more general statement, now comes in with its *individual* application,[9] does not refer to the Galatians as *Gentile Christians* only,[1] any more than in iii. 26–29. — ὅτι] is taken by most expositors, following the Vulgate, as *quoniam.*[2] And this interpretation[3] is the most simple, natural, and correct; the emphasis is laid on υἱοί, which is therefore placed at the end: but because ye are *sons*, God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son, etc. He would not have done this, if ye had not (through the υἱοθεσία) been υἱοί; thus the reception of the Spirit is the experimental and practical divine testimony to the sonship. *If not sons of God*, ye would not be the recipients of the *Spirit* of His Son. The Spirit is the seal of the sonship, into which they had entered through faith—the divine σημεῖον attesting and confirming it; comp. Rom. viii. 16.[4] Others[5] take ὅτι as *that*, and treat it as an abbreviated mode of saying: "But that ye are sons, *is certain by this, that* God has sent forth," etc.[6] This is unnecessarily harsh, and without any similar instance in the N. T.; modes of expression like those in Winer, p. 575 f. and Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 205, are different. Wieseler takes it as equivalent to εἰς ἐκεῖνο, ὅτι:[7] "*as concerns the reality* (ἐστέ is to have the emphasis) *of your state as sons.*" But this would unnecessarily introduce into the vivid and direct character of these short sentences an element of dialectic reflection, which also appears in Matthias' view. Hofmann handles this passage with extreme violence, asserting that ὅτι δέ is an elliptical protasis,—the completion of which is to be derived from the apodosis of the preceding period, from ἐξαπέστ. in ver. 4 onward,—that ἐστὲ υἱοί is apodosis, and that the following ἐξαπέστ. κ.τ.λ. is the further result connected with it. In Hofmann's view, Paul reminds his (Gentile) readers that they are *for this reason* sons, *because* God has done that act ἐξαπέστειλεν κ.τ.λ. (ver. 4), and because He has done it in the way and with the design stated in ver. 4 f. This interpretation is *at variance with linguistic usage*, because the supposed elliptical use of ὅτι δέ does not anywhere occur, and the analogies in the use of εἰ δέ, etc., which Hofmann adduces—some of them, however, only self-invented (as those from the epistles of the apostle, 2 Cor. ii. 2, vii. 12)—are heterogeneous. And how abruptly ἐξαπέστ. ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ. would stand! But, as regards the *thought* also, the interpretation is unsuitable; for they are sons, etc., *not* because God has *sent* Christ, but because they have *become believers* in Him that was sent (iii. 26; John i. 12): it is not that fact itself, but their faith in it, which is the cause of their sonship and of their reception of the Spirit; comp. iii. 14. To refer the sending of the Spirit to the *event of Pentecost* (as Hofmann does), by which God caused His Spirit to initiate "*a presence of a new kind*" in the world, is entirely foreign to the connection.[8] — ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.] for it is τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ Θεοῦ, 1 Cor. ii. 12. Observe the symmetry with ἐξαπέστ.

---

[1] Comp. the change of persons in iii. 14.

[2] See on Eph. i. 5; Rom. viii. 15; and Fritzsche, *in loc.*

[3] Comp. Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 338 f.

[4] Comp. ver. 7.

[5] See especially Dem. 78. 3; 162. 17.

[6] With Chrysostom, Theophylact, Bengel, and others, including Baumgarten-Crusius, Hofmann, and Reithmayr.

[7] Luke vi. 34, xxiii. 41; Rom. i. 27; Col. iii. 24; 2 John 8.

[8] iii. 29, iv. 7.

[9] Comp iii. 26.

---

[1] Hofmann.

[2] Luther, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, Semler, Morus, Rosenmüller, Paulus, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, and others.

[3] On ὅτι, *because*, at the beginning of the sentence, comp. 1 Cor. xii. 15; John xx. 29, xv. 19.

[4] See also Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 340.

[5] Theophylact, Ambrose, Pelagius, Koppe, Flatt, Rückert, Schott.

[6] Comp. iii. 11.

[7] See on Mark xvi. 14; John ii. 18, ix. 17, xi. 51, xvi. 19; 1 Cor. i. 26; 2 Cor. i. 18, xi. 10.

[8] Comp., on the contrary, iii. 2, v. 14.

κ.τ.λ. in ver. 4. The phrase conveys, in point of form, the solemn expression of the *objective* (ver. 4) and *subjective* (ver. 5) certainty of salvation, but, in a dogmatic point of view, the like personal relation of the Spirit, whom God has sent forth from Himself as He sent forth Christ. — *τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*] *So* Paul designates the Holy Spirit, because he represents the reception of the Spirit as the proof of *sonship ;* for the Spirit of the Son cannot be given to any, who are of a different nature and are not also *υἱοὶ Θεοῦ*.[1] But the Holy Spirit is the *Spirit of Christ*, inasmuch as He is the divine principle of Christ's self-communication, by whose dwelling and ruling in the heart Christ Himself[2] dwells and rules livingly, really, and efficaciously (ii. 20) in the children of God.[3] Comp. the Johannean discourses as to the self-revelation and the coming of Christ in the Paraclete. [See Note LV., p. 213.]— *ἡμῶν*] The change of persons arose involuntarily from the apostle's own lively, experimental consciousness of this blessedness.[4] — *κράζον*] The strong word expresses the matter as it was : *with crying* the deep fervor excited by the Spirit broke forth into appeal to the Father.[5] *The Spirit Himself* is here represented as crying (it is different in Rom. *l.c.*), because the Spirit is so completely the active author of the Abba-invocation, that the man who invokes appears only as the organ of the Spirit. Comp. the analogy of the opposite case—the crying of the unclean spirits (Mark i. 26, ix. 26). — *Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ*] The usual view taken by modern expositors,[6] following Erasmus and Beza, in this passage, as in Rom. viii. 15 and in Mark xiv. 36, is, that *ὁ πατήρ* is appended as an *explanation* of the Aramaic *Abba* for Greek readers ;[7] along with which stress is laid on the "*childlike sound*" of the expression, so foreign to the Greek readers.[8] But see, against this view, on Rom. viii. 15. No ; *Ἀββᾶ*, the address of Christ the Son of God to His Father, which had been heard times without number by the apostles and the first believers, had become so established and sacred in Christian prayer that it had assumed the nature of a *proper name*, so that the deep and lively emotion of the consciousness of sonship could now superadd the appellative *ὁ πατήρ* ; and the use of the *two in conjunction* had gradually become so habitual,[9] that in Mark xiv. 36, by an *hysteron proteron*, they are placed even in the mouth of Christ. In opposition to this view, which is adopted by Hilgenfeld and Matthias, it has been objected by Fritzsche,[10] that *ὁ πατήρ* expresses exactly the same as the Aramaic אַבָּא, and that, if אבא had assumed the nature of a *proper name*, this name would very often have occurred in the N. T. and afterwards instead of Θεός; and people would not have said constantly 'Αββᾶ ὁ πατήρ, but also 'Αββᾶ ὁ Θεός. But these objections would only avail to confute our view, if it were maintained that 'Αββᾶ had become *in general* a proper name of God (as was יהוה in the O. T. and the other names of God), so that it would have been used at *every kind* of mention of God. The word is, however, to be regarded merely as a name *used in prayer:* only *he who prayed* addressed God by this name; and just because he was *aware* that this name was an original appellative and expressed the paternal character of God, he added the purely appellative corresponding term ὁ πατήρ, and in doing so satisfied the *fervor* of his feeling of sonship. This remark applies also to Wieseler's objection, that 'Αββᾶ *could only* have continued to be used as an appellative. It might become a name just as well as, for instance, *Adonai*, but with the consciousness still remaining of its appellative origin and import. Moreover, that the address in prayer 'Αββᾶ ὁ πατήρ took its rise among the Greek *Jewish-Christians*, and first became habitual among *them*, is clear of itself on account of the Hebrew *Abba.* It is to be remarked also, that, according to the Rabbins, analogous emotional combinations of a Hebrew and a Greek address, which mean quite the same thing, were in use.[1] Fritzsche's view is, that the 'Αββᾶ of prayer, which had through Christ's use of it become sacred and habitual, was so frequently *explained* on the part of the teachers of the Gentile Christians, as of Paul, by the addition of ὁ πατήρ, that it had become a *habit* with these teachers to say, 'Αββᾶ ὁ πατήρ. But this would be a mechanical explanation which, at least in the case of Paul, is *à priori* not probable, and can least of all be assumed *in a case* where the fervid emotion of prayer[2] is exhibited. Paul would have very *improperly* allowed himself to be ruled by the custom. Wieseler contents himself with the *strengthening of the idea* by two synonymous expressions, but this still fails to explain why πάτερ, πάτερ,[3] or πάτερ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν,[4] is not said, just as κύριε, κύριε, and the like. — On the nominative with the article, as in apposition to the vocative, see Krüger, § 45. 2. 7.

---

[1] Comp. Rom. viii. 9.

[2] Comp. on 2 Cor. iii. 17.

[3] See on Rom. viii. 9, 14.

[4] Comp. Rom. vii. 4.

[5] Comp. Rom. viii. 15 ; also Ps. xxii. 3, xxviii. 1, xxx. 8 ; Baruch iii. 1, iv. 20.

[6] See the usual view of the *ancient* expositors, following Augustine, in Luther: "Abba pater cur geminarit, cum grammatica ratio non appareat, placet vulgata ratio mysterii, quod idem Spiritus fidei sit Judaeorum et gentium, duorum populorum unius Dei," "As to why he cries 'Abba, Father,' since a grammatical reason is not apparent, the ordinarily received explanation of the mystery is satisfactory, viz., that the spirit of faith of Jews and Gentiles is of the one God of two peoples, is the same." Comp. Calvin and Bengel.

[7] So Koppe, Flatt, Winer, Rückert, Usteri, Schott.

[8] Hofmann.

[9] Bengel appropriately remarks, "haec *tessera* filiorum in Novo Testamento," "this pledge of sons in the New Testament."

[10] *ad Rom.* II. p. 140.

Ver. 7. Ὥστε] Inference from vv. 5 and 6. — οὐκέτι] *no longer* as in the pre-Christian condition, when thou wast in bondage to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. — εἶ] The language, addressing every reader, not merely the Gentile readers (Hofmann), advances in its individualizing application.[5] — εἰ δὲ υἱὸς, καὶ κληρονόμος] *But if thou art a son* (and not a slave, who does not inherit from his master), *thou art also an heir*, as future possessor of the Messianic salvation, and art so (not in any way through the law, but) *through God* (διὰ Θεοῦ; see the critical notes), who, as a consequence of His adoption of thee as a son, has made thee also His *heir.* To *Him* thou art indebted for this ultimate blessing, to be attained by means of sonship. This διὰ Θεοῦ cannot also apply to υἱός (Hofmann), so that ἀλλ' should include all the rest of the verse in one sentence. With εἰ δέ a new sentence begins. Otherwise Paul must have written : ἀλλ' υἱὸς, υἱὸς δὲ ὢν καὶ κληρονόμος. Rückert unjustly blames the apostle for having, in εἰ δὲ υἱὸς, καὶ κληρ., departed from the right track of his thoughts, because in ver. 1 he had started at once from the idea of κληρονόμος. But in ver. 1 the apostle, in fact, has not started from the *Messianic* idea of κληρονόμος, but from its lower analogue in civil life. With respect to the *legal* aspect of the conclusion itself, εἰ δὲ υἱὸς, καὶ κληρ.[1]—in which, by the way, the father is conceived as dividing the inheritance during his lifetime,—the idea is not based on the *Jewish* law of inheritance,[2] according to which the (legitimately born) *sons* alone,[3] if there were such,—the first-born among these taking, according to Deut. xxi. 17, a double portion,—were, as a rule, intestate heirs.[4] The apostle's idea is founded on the intestate succession of the *Roman law*, with which Paul as a Roman citizen was acquainted, as in fact it was well known in the provinces and applied there as regarded Roman citizens.[5] According to the Roman law sons and daughters, whether born in marriage or adopted children (and Paul conceives Christians as belonging to the latter class), were intestate heirs. It is evident in itself, and from iii. 28, that υἱός, which Paul used here on account of its correlation with δοῦλος, does not, in the popular mode of expression, exclude the female sex.[6] To assume a mere allusion to *general human* laws of succession (Wieseler) is not sufficient ; for Paul has very distinctly and clearly conceived and designated the υἱότης of the Christian as a relation of *adoption*, which presupposes for his conclusion as to the heirship a *special* legal reference, and not merely the general and vague correlation of the ideas of childship and heirship. The clear precision of his thought vouches for this, and it ought not to be evaded by declaring such a legal question even *foolish* (Hofmann),—a dogmatical judgment which is all the more precipitate, as the specific Johannean idea of the divine *begetting* of the children of God[7] can by no means be found in the Pauline πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας.[8] Besides, υἱοθεσία is, and after all remains, nothing else than the quite definite legal idea of *adoption*, which *separates* the υἱοί εἰσποιητοί or θετοί[9] from those begotten or γνησιοί.

---

[1] See *Erub.* f. 53. 2: מרי כירי (*mi domine, mi* κύριε, "my Lord"). Comp. *Schemoth rabb.* f. 140. 2: קירי מרי אבי. See Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 252.

[2] And let it be noticed, that in *all* the three passages where 'Αββᾶ ὁ πατήρ occurs (Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6; Mark xiv. 36), the *most fervid* tone of prayer prevails.

[3] Comp. Soph. *O. C.* 1101.

[4] Comp. κύριε ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, Ps. viii. 2.

[5] Ver. 5, ἀπολάβωμεν; ver. 6, ἔστε; ver. 7, εἶ. Comp. v. 26, vi. 1.

---

[1] Comp. Rom. viii. 17.

[2] So Grotius, who says: "Jure Hebr. filii tantum haeredes, sed sub illo nomine indicantur omnes fideles cujusque sint sexus," "By the Hebrew law only the sons are heirs ; but under this name all believers, whatever be their sex, are indicated." The fact that Christians are the *adopted children* of God, is decidedly opposed to this.

[3] In Prov. xvii. 2 nothing is said of adoption.

[4] See Keil, *Archäol.* II. § 142; Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 238 f. ; Saalschütz, *M. R.* p. 820 f.

[5] Comp. also Fritzsche, Tholuck, and van Hengel, on Rom. viii. 17.

[6] On the whole of this subject, see C. F. A. Fritzsche, *utrum Pauli argumentatio Rom.* viii. 17 *et Gal.* iv. 7, *Hebraeo an Romano jure aestimanda sit*, in *Fritzschior. Opusc.* p. 143 ff.

[7] Comp. Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 717 ff.

[8] The adoption into the state of children takes place on God's part along with justification, and is on man's part certain to the believing self-consciousness, to which the πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας also attests it. Beyschlag (*Christol.* p. 222) wrongly holds that the communication of the Spirit is itself the υἱοθεσία. No, those who receive the Spirit are already believing, justified, and thereby υἱόθετοι, and obtain through the Spirit the *testimony that* they are υἱοί,—a testimony which agrees with that of their own consciousness, συμμαρτυρεῖ, Rom. viii. 16. See on Rom. viii. 15.

[9] Pollux, iii. 21.

Ver. 8. Ἀλλά] *Nevertheless*, how fearfully at variance is your present retrograde attitude with the fact of this divine deliverance from your previous lost condition! This topic is dealt with down to ver. 11. Observe that ἀλλά introduces the two corresponding relations τότε μέν and νῦν δέ *in conjunction.*[1] — τότε] *then;* reminds the reader of *the* past time, in which they were still δοῦλοι (ver. 7). — οὐκ εἰδότες Θεόν] Cause of the ἐδουλεύσατε which follows. In the *non-knowledge of God* (for οὐκ εἰδότ. forms one idea) lies the fundamental essence of the *heathenism*, to which the apostle's readers had mostly belonged.[2] As to the relation of the thought to Rom. i. 20 f., see on that passage. — ἐδουλεύσατε] The aorist simply designates the state of bondage then existing as now at an end, without looking at its duration or development.[3] — τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσι θεοῖς] *to the gods, who by nature, however, are not so!* For, in the apostle's view, the realities which were worshipped by the heathen as gods, were not gods, but demons.[4] In his view, therefore, their nature was not divine, but at the same time not of *mere mundane matter*;[5] it was *demoniac*,—a point which must have been well known to the Galatians from his oral instruction. — The *negation* denies *subjectively*, from the apostle's view.[6] [See Note LVI., p. 213.]

Ver. 9. Γνόντες Θεόν] *After ye have known God* through the preaching of the gospel. Olshausen's opinion, that εἰδότες denotes more the merely external knowledge *that* God is, while γνόντες signifies the inward essential cognition, is shown to be an arbitrary fancy by passages such as John vii. 37, viii. 55; 2 Cor. v. 16. [See Note LVII., p. 213.] — μᾶλλον δέ] *imo vero*, a corrective climax,[7] in order to give more startling prominence to the following πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε κ.τ.λ., as indicating not a mere falling away from the knowledge of God, but rather a guilty opposition to Him. — γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ] *after ye have been known by God.* This is the *saving* knowledge, of which on God's part men become the objects, when He interests Himself on their behalf to deliver them. Into the *experience* of having been thus graciously known by God the Galatians were brought by means of the divine work which had taken place in them, anticipating their own volition and endeavor—the work of their calling, enlightenment, and conversion[8] [see Note LVIII., p. 214]; so that they therefore, when they *knew* God, became in that very knowledge aware of *their being known* by God,—the one being implied in the other—through their divinely bestowed admission into the fellowship of Christ.[9] Hofmann desires the condition of the *acceptance* of grace to be mentally supplied; but this is arbitrary in itself, and is also incorrect, because those, who are the objects of God's gracious knowledge, are already known to Him by means of His πρόγνωσις as the *credituri*, "those who are to believe," and are ordained by Him to salvation (see on Rom. viii. 29 f.). But the *literal* sense *cognoscere* is not to be altered either into *approbare*, *amare*,[1] or into *agnoscere suos;*[2] nor is it to be understood in the sense of Hophal: *brought to the knowledge;*[3] nor can we, with Olshausen, turn it into the being penetrated with the love wrought by God, which *only follows* upon the being known by God, 1 Cor. viii. 3. Lastly, there has been introduced, in a way entirely un-Pauline, the idea of the self-recognition of the Divine Spirit in us,[4] or of the consciousness of the identity of the human and the divine knowing (Hilgenfeld). On the deliberate change from the active to the passive, γνόντες, γνωσθέντες, comp. Phil. iii. 12. Luther, moreover, appropriately remarks, "non *ideo* cognoscuntur *quia* cognoscunt, sed contra *quia* cogniti sunt, *ideo* cognoscunt," "It is not because they know that they are known; but, on the contrary, they know because they have been known." — πῶς] "interrogatio *admirabunda*," "wonderful question" (Bengel), as in ii. 12. — πάλιν] does not mean *backwards*,[5] as in Homer,[6] — a rendering opposed to the usage of the N. T. generally, and here in particular to the πάλιν ἄνωθεν which follows; it means *iterum*, and refers to the fact that the readers had previously been already in bondage to the στοιχεῖα, namely, most of them as *heathen*. Now they turn indeed (ἐπιστρέφετε, *present tense*, as in i. 6) to the *Jewish* ordinances; but the heathen *and* Jewish elements[7] are *both* included in the category of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου,[8] so that Paul is *logically correct* in using the πάλιν; and the hypothesis of Nösselt,[9] that the greater part of the readers had been previously proselytes of the gate, is entirely superfluous, and indeed at variance with the description of the pre-Christian condition of the Galatians given in ver. 8; for according to ver. 8, the great mass of them must have been purely heathen before their conversion, because there is no mention of any intermediate condition between τότε and νῦν. According to Wieseler,[10] πάλιν is intended to point back to their *conversion to Christ*, so that the turning to the στοιχεῖα is designated as a second renewed *conversion* (ἐπιστρέφετε), namely, *in pejus*. This would yield an ironical contrast, but is rendered impossible by the words οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλ. θέλετε. Wieseler is driven to adopt so artificial an explanation, because he understands the στοιχεῖα as referring to the *law* only; and this compels him afterwards to give an incorrect explanation of οἷς. — ἀσθενῆ κ.

---

[1] But so, that the thought introduced by δέ (ver. 9) is the main thought. Comp. Baeumlein, *Partikell.* p. 168.

[2] Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 5; Acts xvii. 23, 30, *et al.*

[3] See Kühner, II. p. 73 f.

[4] See on 1 Cor. x. 20.

[5] Ewald, comp. Wisd. xiii. 1 ff.

[6] Comp. 2 Chron. xiii. 9: ἐγένετο εἰς ἱερέα τῷ μὴ ὄντι Θεῷ.

[7] Rom. viii. 34; Eph. v. 11; Jacobs, *ad Ach. Tat.* II. p. 955; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* iii. 13. 6; Grimm, on Wisd. viii. 19.

[8] Hence in point of *fact* Theophylact (following Chrysostom) rightly explains: προσληφθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, "taken hold of by God." Because of *God's* knowing them *they* have known God; consequently not, "proprio Marte vel acumine sui ingenii vel industria, sed *quia Deus misericordia sua eos praevenerit*, quum nihil minus quam de ipso cogitarent," "by their own effort or the acuteness of their genius or by their industry, but *because God by His mercy has anticipated them*, while they were thinking less of nothing than of Him," Calvin.

[9] Comp. Ignat. *ad Magnes.* interpol. 1: δι' οὗ (through Christ) ἔγνωτε Θεὸν, μᾶλλον δὲ ὑπ'

αὐτοῦ ἐγνώσθητε, "through whom we knew God, or rather were known of Him." Similarly, in an opposite sense, *ad Smyrn.* 5: ὅν τινες ἀγνοοῦντες ἀρνοῦνται (*abnegant*), μᾶλλον δὲ ἠρνήθησαν (*abnegali sunt*) ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (by Christ), "whom some ignorantly deny, or rather were denied of Him." See on 1 Cor. viii. 3, xiii. 12; also Matt. vii. 23.

[1] Grotius and others.

[2] Wetstein, Vater, Winer, Rückert, Usteri, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others.

[3] Beza, Er. Schmidt, Cornelius à Lapide, Wolf, Nösselt, Koppe, Flatt, and others.

[4] Matthies.

[5] Flatt, Hofmann.

[6] See Duncan, *Lex.* ed. Rost, p. 886; Nägelsbach *z. Ilias*, p. 34, ed. 3.

[7] On the latter, see Heb. vii. 18 f.

[8] See on ver. 3.

[9] *Opusc.* I. p. 293 ff.; comp. Mynster in his *kl. theol. Schr.* p. 76; Credner, *Einl.*, and Olshausen.

[10] Comp. also Reithmayr.

πτωχά] because they cannot *effect* and *bestow*, what God by the sending of His Son has effected and bestowed (ver. 5).[1] — πάλιν ἄνωθεν] for those reverting to Judaism desired to *begin again from the commencement* the slave-service of the στοιχεῖα, which they had abandoned.[2] Not a pleonasm, as πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου (Matt. xxvi. 42), πάλιν αὖτις (Hom. *Il.* i. 59), or δεύτερον αὖθις (Hom. *Il.* i. 513) ; but the repetition is represented as *a new commencement* of the matter, as ἐκ νέας αὖθις ἀρχῆς, "again from a new beginning,"[3] and πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, "again from the beginning."[4] It is just the same in the instances in Wetstein. The οἷς is, however, the simple dative as in ver. 8 and usually with δουλεύειν ; it is not equivalent to ἐν οἷς (Wieseler), with δουλ. used absolutely. — θέλετε] *ye desire*, ye have the wish and the longing for, this servitude![5]

Ver. 10. Facts which vouch for the ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν κ.τ.λ. just expressed. — The *interrogative* view, which Griesbach, Koppe, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Hilgenfeld, following Battier,[6] take, has been again abandoned by Usteri, Schott, and Wieseler ; and Hofmann prefers the sense of sorrowful *exclamation*. But the continuance of the reproachful interrogative form (ver. 9) corresponds better to the increasing pitch of surprise and amazement, and makes ver. 11 come in with greater weight. — παρατηρεῖσθε] Do ye already so far realize your θέλετε ? Ye take care, *sedulo vobis observatis*, "solicitously observe," namely, to neglect nothing which is prescribed in the law for certain days and seasons.[7] The idea *superstitiose*, "of superstitiously,"[8] is not implied in παρα, nor the *praeter fidem*, "beside faith," which Bengel finds in it. — ἡμέρας] Sabbaths, fast and feast days. Comp. Rom. xiv. 5, 6 [Col. ii. 16]. — μῆνας] is usually referred to the *new moons*. But these, the feast-days at the beginning of each month, come under the previous category of ἡμήρας. In keeping with the other points, παρατηρεῖσθαι μῆνας must be the *observance of certain months as pre-eminently sacred months*. Thus the *seventh* month (*Tisri*), as the proper sabbatical month, was specially sacred ;[9] and the fourth, fifth, seventh, and tenth months were distinguished by special fasts. — καιρούς] מוֹעֲדִים, Lev. xxiii. 4. The holy *festal seasons*, such as those of the Passover, Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles, are meant ; "quibus hoc aut illud fas erat aut nefas," "whereon this or that was lawful or unlawful," Erasmus.—ἐνιαυτούς] applies to the *sabbatical years*,[10] which occurred *every seventh year*, but not to the *jubilee years*, which had, at least after the time of Solomon, fallen into abeyance.[11] But that the Galatians were at that time in some way actually celebrating a sabbatical year (Wieseler), cannot be certainly inferred from ἐνιαυτ., which has in reality its due warrant as belonging to the consistency and completeness of the *theory*. On the whole passage, comp. Col. ii. 16, and Philo, *de septenar.* p. 286.—From our passage, moreover, we see how far, and within what limits, the Galatians had already been led astray.[1] They had not yet adopted *circumcision*, but were only in danger of being brought to it (v. 2, 3, 12, vi. 12, 13). Nothing at all is said in the epistle as to any *distinction of meats* (comp. Col. *l.c.*), except so far as it was implied in the observance of days, etc. Usteri (comp. Rückert) is of opinion that Paul did not mention circumcision and the distinction of meats, because he desired to represent the present religious attitude of his readers as analogous to their *heathen* condition. But, according to the comprehensive idea of the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*, even the mention of circumcision and the distinctions of meats would have been in no way inappropriate to the *πάλιν ἄνωθεν*. Olshausen quite arbitrarily asserts that the usages mentioned stand *by synecdoche for all.*

---

[1] Comp. Rom. viii. 3, x. 12 ; Heb. vii. 18.

[2] ἀρχαῖς προτέραις ἑπόμενοι, "proceeding upon their former beginnings." Pind. *Ol.* x. 94. Comp. Wisd. xix. 6.

[3] Plut. *solert. anim.* p. 959.

[4] Barnab. *Ep.* 16.

[5] Comp. ver. 21.

[6] *Bibl. Brem.* VI. p. 104.

[7] Comp. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 5. 5 : παρατηρεῖν τὰς ἑβδομάδας, "to carefully observe the seventh days ;" also Dio Cass. liii. 10 (of the observance of a law).

[8] Winer, Bretschneider, Olshausen, and others.

[9] See Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 469 f. ; Keil, *Archäol.* I. p. 368 ff.

[10] See, as to these, Ewald, p. 488 ff. ; Keil, p. 371 ff.

[11] Ewald, p. 501.

Ver. 11. *Φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς, μήπως κ.τ.λ.*] not *attraction*,[2] because, if this had been the case, *ὑμεῖς* must have been the subject of *μήπως κ.τ.λ.*[3] On the contrary, *φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς* is to be taken by itself, and *μήπως κ.τ.λ.* as a more precise definition of it : "*I am afraid about you, lest perhaps I,*" etc.[4] It is not without cause that Paul has added *ὑμᾶς*, but in the consciousness that his apprehension had reference not to *his own interests* (his possibly fruitless labor, taken by itself), but to his *readers; they themselves* were the object of his anxiety, *their* deliverance, *their* salvation.[5]—*εἰκῇ*] *without saving result* (iv. 11 ; 1 Cor. xv. 2), because ye are in the course of falling away from the life of Christian faith, which through my labors was instituted among you. —*κεκοπίακα*] *Perfect indicative ;* for the thought was before the apostle's mind, that this case had actually occurred.[6]—*εἰς ὑμᾶς*] *for you ; εἰς* denotes the *reference* of the toilsome labor which he had undergone *to* the Galatians. Comp. Rom. xvi. 6. — Luther (1524), moreover, aptly remarks on ver. 11 : "Lacrymas Pauli haec verba spirant," "these words of Paul breathe tears."

Ver. 12.[7] After this expression of anxiety, now follows the exhortation to return, and with what cordiality of affection ! "Subito . . . *ἤθη καὶ πάθη*, argumenta conciliantia et moventia admovet," "He suddenly employs appeals to win their favor and move their sympathy," Bengel. — γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγὼ, ὅτι κἀγὼ ὡς ὑμεῖς] is explained in two ways,—*either* as a summons to give up Judaistic habits, *or* as a summons to love. The *correct* interpretation is : "*Become as I*, become free from Judaism as I am, *for I also have become as you ;* for I also, when I abandoned Judaism, thereby became as a Gentile (ii. 14 ; Phil. iii. 7 f.), and placed myself on the same footing with you who were then Gentiles, by non-subjection to the Mosaic law. Now render to me the *reciprocum*, 'reciprocity,' to which love has a claim."[1] This interpretation is not only in the highest degree suitable to the thoughtful delicacy of the apostle—who might justly (in opposition to Wieseler's objection) represent his former secession from Judaism as a service rendered to his readers (as Gentiles), because he had in fact seceded to be *a converter of the Gentiles*—but is the only explanation in harmony with the words and the context. Ἐγενόμην must be supplied in the second clause, and to take it from γίνεσθε is just as allowable as in 1 Cor. xi. 1 (in opposition to Hofmann).[2] As to κἀγώ, comp. on 1 Cor. xi. 1. Following Chrysostom, Theodoret and Theophylact, Erasmus (in his *Paraphrase*), Vatablus, Semler, and others, also Matthies, interpret : "*Become as I*, abandon Judaism ; *for I also was once* a zealous adherent of it *like you*, but have undergone a change." But as ἐγενόμην is the only supplement which suggests itself in harmony with the context, Paul must have *written* the ἤμην, which on this view requires to be supplied,[3] and this ἤμην would in that case have conveyed the main element of the motive.[4] But as Paul has written, the point of the passage lies in his desire that his readers should become like unto him, as he also had become like to the readers. Schott[5] correctly supplies ἐγενόμην, but he again supplies ἐγενέσθε with ὑμεῖς : "siquidem ego quoque factus sum, quales vos facti estis, cum Jesu Christo nomen daretis, abjeci studia pristina Judaismi pariter atque vos olim abjecistis," "Since I also became, as ye became when ye enlisted with Jesus Christ ; I rejected the former pursuits of Judaism, in like manner as ye formerly rejected them." Incorrectly, because this would presuppose that Paul was speaking to *Jewish Christians*, and because the motive, thus understood, could only have been of real avail as a motive in the event of Paul having been converted *later* than the Galatians. Jerome, Erasmus,[6] Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Michaelis, Rückert, interpret : "Become as I, lay aside Judaism, *for I also have lovingly accommodated myself to you ;*" comp. Wieseler : "Because I also, *when I brought the gospel to you, from a loving regard toward you Gentiles put aside Jewish habits*" (ii. 14 ; 1 Cor. ix. 21).[7] Against this view it may be urged, that, in Paul's working as an apostle to the Gentiles, his non-Judaistic attitude was *a matter of principle*, and not *a matter of considerate accommodation*, and that long *before* he preached to the Galatians. Besides, the result would be a dissimilar relation between the two members ; for Paul cannot require the putting away of Jewish habits as a matter of affectionate consideration, but only as a Christian necessity. [See Note LIX., p. 214.] The reciprocity of what is to be done under *this* aspect is the point of the demand. According to Ewald, Paul says, "As Christians, follow ye entirely my example, because I too am a *simple Christian* and, strictly speaking, *not more than you*." But thus the very idea that was most essential, that of "a simple Christian" would not be expressed. Others, including Luther, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Calovius, Wolf, Bengel, Zachariae, and Morus, find the sense : "*Love me, as I love you.*" But how could the reader discover this in the words since Paul has not yet said a word as to any deficiency of love to him ? Beza and Grotius wrongly appeal to the mode of designating one who is beloved as an *alter ego*, an idea which *ὡς ἐγώ* and *ὡς ὑμεῖς* do not at all convey. — *ἀδελφοὶ, δέομαι ὑμῶν*] The language of softened and deeply moved love. The words are to be referred not to the *sequel*,[1] in which there is nothing besought, but to the previous summons, with which he *beseeches* them to comply. — *οὐδέν με ἠδικήσατε*] suggests a motive for granting his entreaty *γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ*, by recalling their relation to him, as it had stood at the time when he first preached the gospel to them : "How should ye not grant me this entreaty, since ye have done no injury to me (and certainly therefore in this point just asked for, will not vex me by non-compliance) ; but ye know," etc. According to Chrysostom, Theophylact, Augustine, Pelagius, Luther, Calvin, Estius, Windischmann, and others, including Winer, the words are intended to give an assurance that the previous severe language had not flowed from displeasure and irritation against his readers. But Paul has in fact already changed, immediately before, to the tone of love ; hence such an assurance here would come in too late and inappropriately. Nor would the *οὐδέν με ἠδικήσατε*, which on account of the connection with ver. 13 evidently applies to the period of his first visit, necessarily exclude a subsequent offence ; so that the "*igitur non habui, quod vobis irascerer*," "I have, therefore, had no reason to be incensed with you" (Winer), which has been discovered in these words, is not necessarily implied in them. The *temporal* reference of the *οὐδέν με ἠδικήσατε*, which is definitely and necessarily given by ver. 13, excludes also the view of Beza, Bengel, Rückert,

---

[1] De Wette very arbitrarily considers that the present tense denotes, not the *reality* then present, but only the necessary consequence of the *ἐπιστρ.* and *δουλ. θέλετε*, *conceived* as being already present.

[2] Winer, Usteri, Olshausen, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Buttmann.

[3] Plat. *Legg.* x. p. 886 A : *φοβοῦμαί γε τοὺς μοχθηροὺς . . . μή πως ὑμῶν καταφρονήσωσιν*, "I fear the knaves, that perchance they may despise you." *Phaedr.* p. 232 C, *φοβούμενοι τοὺς μὲν οὐσίαν κεκτημένους, μὴ χρήμασιν αὐτοὺς ὑπερβάλωνται*, "Fearing those having acquired property, that they might exceed them in wealth." Diod. Sic. iv. 40 ; Thuc. iv. 1. 1 ; Xen. *Anab.* iii. 5. 18, vii. 1. 2 ; Soph. *Trach.* 547. See the passages in Winer, p. 581 ff. ; Krüger, *gramm. Unters.* III. p. 162 ff.; Kühner, II. p. 611.

[4] Comp. Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 239 D : *τοιοῦτον σῶμα οἱ φίλοι . . . φοβοῦνται*, "such a body the friends fear" (are apprehensive about it). Soph. *O. R.* 767 : *δέδοικ' ἐμαυτὸν . . . μὴ πολλ' ἄγαν εἰρημέν' ῃ μοι*, "I was alarmed about myself that too many things had been spoken by me."

[5] The mode of expression is analogous also in a *hostile* sense, *e.g.* Xen. *Hell.* ii. 3. 18 : *ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν Θηραμένην, μὴ συῤῥυείησαν πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ πολῖται*, "They feared Theramenes, lest the citizens might pass over to him." Thuc. iv. 8. 5 : *τὴν δὲ νῆσον ταύτην φοβούμενοι, μὴ ἐξ αὐτῆς τὸν πόλεμον σφίσι ποιῶνται*, "having feared this island, lest from it they might make war on them."

[6] Hermann, *ad Eur. Med.* 310, Elmsl. ; Winer, p. 469 ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 84 E.

[7] As to vv. 12–20, see C. F. A. Fritzsche, in Fritzschior. Opusc. p. 231 ff.

---

[1] So Koppe, Winer, Usteri, Neander, Fritzsche, de Wette, Hilgenfeld.

[2] Comp. Phil. ii. 5 ; and see generally, Krüger, § lxii. 4. 1 ; Winer, p. 541 f.; Xen. *Anab.* vii. 7. 13 : προερῶν ἅπερ αὐτῷ.

[3] As Justin. *ad Graec.* ii. p. 40. *ed. Col.* γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγὼ, ὅτι κἀγὼ ἤμην ὡς ὑμεῖς, "become as I, because I also was as ye."

[4] *Fui*, nec amplius sum, "I *was*, but am no longer."

[5] Comp. Rosenmüller and Flatt.

[6] In his *Annotationes.*

[7] So also in substance Olshausen, Ellicott, Reithmayr, and others ; similarly also Hofmann. According to Hofmann, Paul says of himself *that he places himself on an equality with his Gentile readers* (inasmuch as, where his vocation requires it, he lives among the Gentiles as if he were not a Jew), and, on the other hand, requires of them

---

that they shall place themselves on an equality with him (and therefore shall not live after the Jewish manner, but shall share his freedom from the law, after he has accommodated himself to their position aloof from the law). Hofmann insists, namely, on the supplying of γίνομαι (present), which, as well as γίνεσθε, he understands in the sense of *behaving* and *conducting* themselves. This sense, however, is not suitable, since the readers are really to *become different*, and not merely to *accommodate themselves* to another line of conduct ; the γίνεσθαι would not therefore retain the same sense in the two halves of the verse. See also, in opposition to this view, Möller on de Wette. The use of γίνεσθαι in the sense of *se praestare* is, however, in itself linguistically admissible (see Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 7. 4), but not in conformity with the proofs adduced by Hofmann ; as to which Dissen, *ad Dem. d. Cor.* p. 239 f., takes the correct view.

[1] Luther, Zeger, Koppe, and others.

Ewald, and others, that Paul represents the vexation occasioned to him by the relapse of his readers as having not occurred,[1] in order to encourage them by this *meiosis* to a compliance with the γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ. Lastly, those interpretations are incorrect, which, in spite of the enclitic με, lay an antithetic emphasis on the latter; as that of Grotius ("*me privatim*," "me personally"), that of Rettig[2] (not me, *but God and Christ*), and that of Schott (nihil mihi nocuistis, *vobis tantum*, "you have injured me nothing, but only yourselves"). Nor is Hofmann's view more correct: that Paul, taking occasion by a passage in the (alleged) epistle of his readers, desired only to say to them that the οὐδέν με ἠδικήσ. *was not enough;* instead of having *merely* experienced *nothing unbecoming* from them, he could not but expect more at their hands, for which reason they ought to recall what their attitude to him had been at his first visit to them. In this view what is supposed to form the train of thought is a purely gratuitous importation, with the fiction of a letter written by the Galatians superadded; and the assumed strong contrast to the sequel must have been marked by a μέν after οὐδέν,[3] or by ἀλλά instead of δέ, in order to be intelligible. — On ἀδικεῖν with accusative of the person and of the thing, comp. Acts xxv. 10; Philem. 18; Wolf, *Lept.* p. 343; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 6. 7.

Vv. 13, 14. Contrast to the preceding οὐδέν με ἠδικ. Comp. Chrysostom: "Ye have done nothing to injure me; but ye doubtless know, that I on account of weakness of the flesh preached the gospel to you the former time, and that ye," etc. — δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός] The only correct explanation, because the only one agreeable to linguistic usage, is that adopted by Flatt, Fritzsche, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, and others, also by Winer, *Gramm.* p. 373, *on account of* weakness of the flesh:[4] so that it is clear, that on Paul's first journey through Galatia (Acts xvi. 6) he was compelled by reason of bodily weakness to make a stay there, which properly did not form a part of his plan; and that during this sojourn, forced on him by necessity, he preached the gospel to the Galatians. *How* he suffered, and *from what cause*, whether from natural sickness,[5] or from ill-treatment which he had previously endured on account of the gospel,[1] we do not know. The mention of an *involuntary* or rather *quite unpremeditated* working among the Galatians is not *opposed* to the apostle's aim,[2] but *favorable* to it; because the love which received him so heartily and joyfully must have been all the greater, the less it depended on the duty of befitting gratitude for a benefit *previously* destined for the recipients, and for exertions made expressly on their account. Many others have understood διά as denoting the apostle's *condition*: "*amidst bodily weakness*," which is then referred by some, and indeed most expositors, following Chrysostom and Luther, to *persecutions and sufferings*, by others to his *insignificant appearance*,[3] by others to *sickness*,[4] and by others even to *embarrassment* and *perplexity* on account of the strange circumstances.[5] But in this case διά must have been used with the *genitive*;[6] for expressions such as διὰ δῶμα, διὰ νύκτα, διὰ στόμα, δι' αἰθέρα, κ.τ.λ., in which διά denotes *stretching through*, are *merely poetical*.[7] We should be obliged to think of the *occasioning* state (as in διὰ τοῦτο, διὰ πολλά, κ.τ.λ.), which would just bring us back to our interpretation. Hence we must reject also the explanation of Grotius: "per varios casus, per mille pericula rerum perrexi, ut vos instituerem," "through various calamities, through a thousand dangers, I proceeded to establish you." Others still have gone so far as to refer δι' ἀσθ. τῆς σαρκός to weakness of the *Galatians*, to which Paul *accommodated himself*. So Jerome, Estius, Hug, and Rettig *l.c.* p. 108 ff.: "*I have preached to you on account of the weakness of your flesh*," which is supposed to mean: "I have in my preaching had respect to the infirmity of your flesh." Utterly mistaken: because Paul must necessarily have added a modal definition to εὐηγγ. (even if it had only been an οὕτως), or must have written κατ' ἀσθ. instead of δι' ἀσθ.; moreover, ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου in ver. 14 shows that Paul meant the ἀσθένεια τῆς σαρκός to apply *to himself*. — τὸ πρότερον] may mean either: *earlier*, at an earlier time, so that it would be said from the standpoint of the present,[8] which in relation to the past is the later time (John vi. 62, vii. 51, ix. 8; 2 Cor. i. 15; 1 Tim. i. 13; 1 Pet. i. 14; Heb. x. 32; LXX. Deut. ii. 12; 1 Chron. ix. 2; 1 Macc. xi. 27); or *the former time*, so that the same fact (the preaching) took place twice (Heb. iv. 6, vii. 27). It is interpreted in the former sense by Usteri and Fritzsche, and in the latter by Koppe, Winer, Rückert, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Wieseler, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Hofmann, and others.[9] The latter is the correct view, so that τὸ πρότερον presupposes a *second* sojourn of the apostle among the Galatians. For if he had preached among them only once, τὸ πρότερον would have been quite an idle, superfluous addition. But Paul adds it just in order to denote quite distinctly his *first* visit, during which he founded the churches (Acts xvi. 6) : at his *second* visit (Acts xviii. 23), the happy experiences which he had enjoyed τὸ πρότερον were not repeated in such full measure ; the churches were already tainted by Judaism. Comp. Introd. § 2, 3. Fritzsche, indeed, maintains that vv. 18, 19 imply that Paul before the composition of the epistle had only *once* visited the Galatians ; but see on ver. 19.

---

[1] "All was forgotten and forgiven," Ewald.

[2] In the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 109.

[3] As to Plat. *Rep.* p. 398 A, Hartung, *Partik.* I. p. 163, forms a right judgment.

[4] Bengel also translates correctly: "*propter infirmitatem*," "because of weakness," but erroneously explains that the weakness was not indeed "*causa praedicationis ipsius*," "the cause of his preaching," but "*adjumentum*, cur P. *efficacius* praedicaret, cum Galatae facilius rejicere posse viderentur," "an aid whereby Paul preached the more efficaciously, although the Galatians might seem to be able to reject him the more readily." Similarly, but still more incorrectly, Schott, who detects an "*acumen singulare*" in Paul's saying: "*per ipsam aegritudinem carnis* doctrinam divinam vobis tradidi," "through very weakness of the flesh, I delivered to you the divine doctrine;" for the fact that Paul, although sick, had preached very zealously, had been of great influence in making his preaching more successful. In this interpretation everything is mistaken: for διά must have been used with the *genitive;* the "*ipsam*," "very," and the thought of *successful* preaching are quite gratuitously imported; and the whole of the alleged "*acumen*" would be completely out of place *here*, where Paul wishes to remind his readers of their *love* then shown to him, and *not* of the efficacy of his preaching.

[5] Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 7. In respect to 2 Cor. *l.c.*, Holsten, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1861, p. 250 f., conceives it to refer to epileptical disturbances of the circulatory and nervous system, such as occur among *visionaries.* Comp. his *Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 85.

---

[1] Comp. Gal. vi. 17.

[2] As Rückert objects.

[3] Calvin.

[4] Rückert, Matthies, Olshausen, Ewald; comp. also in Jerome.

[5] Baumgarten-Crusius.

[6] See Matthiae, p. 1353; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 138.

[7] See Schaefer, *ad Mosch.* 4. 91; Bernhardy, p. 236 f.; Kühner, II. p. 282.

[8] Thuc. i. 12. 2: τὴν νῦν Βοιωτίαν, πρότερον δὲ Καδμηΐδα γῆν καλουμένην, "the country now called Boeotia, but at an earlier time Cadmeis," Isocr. *de pace*, § 121 and Bremi *in loc.*

[9] The older expositors, translating it *jam pridem* (Vulgate), or *prius* (Erasmus, Beza, Calvin), or *antea* (Castalio), do not for the most part attempt any more precise explanation. Luther: "*for the first time*." Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact do not give any explanation of τὸ πρότ.

Ver. 14. Still dependent on ὅτι, as is logically required by the *contrast* to οὐδέν με ἠδικ., which is introduced by οἴδατε δὲ, ὅτι. — τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου κ.τ.λ.] As to the reading ὑμῶν, see the critical notes. The sense is : *that ye were put to the proof as respected my bodily weakness* (namely, as to your receiving and accepting my announcements, demands, etc., notwithstanding this my suffering and impotent appearance ; see the antithesis, ἀλλ' ὡς κ.τ.λ.) ; *this proof ye have not rejected with disdain and aversion, but on the contrary have submitted yourselves to it so excellently, that ye received me as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus.* The καί is not *and yet*,[1] but the simple *and*, continuing the address (οἴδατε, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.). — ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου] is the more precise definition of τὸν πειρασμ. ὑμῶν, specifying *wherein* the readers had to undergo a trial,—namely, in the fact of Paul's having then preached to them in such *bodily weakness.*[2] Hence ἐν τῇ σαρκί did not require the connecting article, as it is in reality blended with τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν so as to form one idea.[3] And the *definition of the sense* of ἐν τῇ σαρκι μου is derived from δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός in ver. 13. Fritzsche, *l.c.* p. 245, objects to the sense which is given by the reading ὑμῶν : 1. *sententiam ab h. l. abhorrere,* "*The sense is inconsistent with the connection.*" But how aptly does the *negative* assertion, that the Galatians, when they were put to the trial by the apostle's sickness, did not despise and reject this trial, correspond with the positive idea, that, on the contrary, they have received him as an angel of God ! And how suitable are the two ideas together to the previous οὐδέν με ἠδικήσατε ! 2. *Sententiam verbis parum aptis conceptam esse ; expectaras* καλῶς ὑπεμείνατε, "*The sense is inadequately expressed by the words ; and that we should expect* καλῶς ὑπεμείνατε." But this καλῶς ὑπεμείνατε is in fact most exhaustively represented by the negative and positive testimony *taken together ;* the negative testimony expresses the *acceptance*, and the positive the *standing*, of the πειρασμός. 3. *The sense does not suit the following* ἀλλ' . . . ἐδέξασθέ με. But even with the adoption of the reading ὑμῶν the rejection *of the apostle* is in point of *fact* negatived ; hence τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν . . . ἐξεπτύσατε cannot be inappropriate to the ἐδέξασθέ με which follows. Lachmann[4] makes καὶ τὸν πειρασμ. ὑμ. ἐν τ. σ. μ. dependent on οἴδατε (placing a colon after ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου), whereby the flow of the discourse is quite unnecessarily broken. [See Note LX., p. 214.] — ἐξεπτύσατε] expresses the sense of ἐξουθ. figuratively and by way of climax, adding the idea of detestation.[1] So forcible an expression of the negative serves to give the greater prominence to the positive counterpart which follows.[2] This deviation from the Greek usage should be acknowledged, and must be considered as caused by ἐξουθ., as in fact Paul is fond of repeating, not without emphasis, compounds presenting the same preposition (ii. 4, 13 ; Rom. ii. 18, xi. 7, *et al.*). — ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν] a climax added asyndetically in the excitement of feeling, and presenting to a still greater extent than ὡς ἄγγελ. Θεοῦ (Heb. i. 4 ; Phil. ii. 10 ; Col. i. 16) the high reverence and love with which he had been received by them, and that as *a divine messenger.* Comp. Matt. x. 40 ; John xiii. 20. Observe also, that even among the Galatians Paul doubtless preached in the first instance to the *Jews* (whose loving behavior towards the apostle was then shared in by the Gentiles also) ; hence the comparison with an *angel* and with *Christ* in our passage is in keeping with the apostle's historical recollection, and does not render it at all necessary to assume an ὕστερον πρότερον in the representation, which would thus anticipate the already Christian view.

---

[1] Koppe, Winer, Matthies.

[2] Comp. Plat. *Phil.* p. 21 A : ἐν σοὶ πειρώμεθα, *upon thee* we would make the trial. Hom. *Il.* xix. 384, πειρήθη . . . ἐν ἔντεσι, "was tried in the harness." Comp. also βασανίζεσθαι ἐν, "put to the test," Plat. *Pol.* vi. p. 503 A.

[3] See on iii. 26.

[4] Comp. Buttmann in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1860, p. 379.

Note.—According to the *Recepta* τ. πειρ. μου τὸν ἐν τ. σ. μ., or, as the first μου has special evidence against it, according to the reading τὸν πειρ. τὸν ἐν τ. σ. μ., the explanation must be : "*My bodily temptation ye have not despised or disdainfully rejected,*" that is, "Ye have not on account of my sickness, by which I have been tried of God, rejected me, as the bodily impotence in which it exhibited me to you might have induced you to do." Taken by itself, this sense, and the mode of expressing it, would be suitable enough,[3] even without the hypothesis, based on ἐξεπτ., of some *nauseous* sickness.[4] [See Note LXI., p. 214.]

Ver. 15. *Of what nature, then, was your self-congratulation?* A sorrowful question ! for the earnestness with which the Galatians had then congratulated themselves on the apostle's account, contrasting so sadly with their present circumstances, compelled him to infer that that congratulation was nothing but an effervescent, fleeting, and fickle excitement. Hence the reading ποῦ οὖν (see the critical notes) is a gloss in substance correct ; comp. Rom. iii. 27. Others explain it : *On what was* your self-congratulation *grounded? Why* did you pronounce yourselves so happy ?[5] In this case *qualis* would have to be taken in the peculiar sense : *how caused*, which, however, would require to be distinctly suggested by the context. Others still, as Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Piscator, Calovius, Wolf, and including Baumgarten-Crusius, Hilgenfeld, Reiche, Wieseler, interpret : "*How great* (comp. Eph. i. 14) therefore was your congratulation ! how very happy you pronounced yourselves !" But then the *ὥστε* in ver. 16 would be deprived of its logical reference, which, according to our interpretation, is contained in *τίς οὖν ὁ μακαρ. ὑμ.* And the words would, in fact, contain merely a superfluous and feeble exclamation. — The *μακαρισμός* (comp. Rom. iv. 6, 9), with which *ὑμῶν* stands as the genitive of the *subject*,[1] and not as the genitive of the *object*,[2]—for the object is obvious of itself,—refers to the circumstance that they had congratulated *themselves*, not that they had been congratulated by *Paul and others*,[3] or even that *they* (the Galatians) had congratulated *the apostle*.[4] See the sequel. The word, synonymous with *εὐδαιμονισμός*, is never equivalent to *μακαριότης*.[5] — *μαρτυρῶ γὰρ ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.*] justification of the expression just used, *ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν*. — *τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς κ.τ.λ.*] A description of the overwhelming love, which was ready for any sacrifice. Such proverbial modes of expression, based upon the high value and indispensableness of the eyes (Prov. vii. 2 ; Ps. xvii. 8 ; Zech. ii. 8 ; Matt. xviii. 9 ; and comp. Vulpius and Doering, *ad Catull.* i. 3. 5), are current in all languages. Nevertheless, Lomler,[6] Rückert, and Schott have explained the passage quite *literally* : that Paul had some *malady of the eyes*, and here states that, if it had been possible, the Galatians would have given him their own sound eyes. But considering the currency of the proverbial sense, how arbitrarily is this view hazarded, seeing that nowhere else do we find a trace of any *malady* of the eyes in the apostle ![7] Rückert and Schott, indeed, found specially on *εἰ δυνατόν*, and maintain that, to express the meaning of the ordinary view, Paul must have written : "if it had been *necessary*." But *in any case* the idea was a *purely imaginary* one, and as a matter of fact *practically impossible* (*ἀδύνατον*) ; if Paul, therefore, had said : "if it had been *necessary*," he would at any rate have expressed himself *unsuitably*. Besides, *εἰ δυνατόν* expresses the self-sacrificing love *in a yet far stronger* degree. And, if Paul had not spoken *proverbially*, the whole assurance would have been so *hyperbolical*, that he certainly could not have stood sponsor for it with the earnest *μαρτυρῶ ὑμῖν*. [See Note LXII., p. 214 seq.] — *ἐξορύξ.*] the standing word for the extirpation of the eyes.[8] — *ἐδώκατέ μοι*] namely, *as property*, as a love-pledge of the most joyful self-sacrificing devotedness, not *for use* (Hofmann, following older expositors),—a view which, if we do not explain it of a disease of the eyes in the apostle's case, leads to a monstrous idea. *Without* ἀν (see the critical notes) the matter is expressed as more indubitable, the condition contained in the protasis being rhetorically disregarded.[1]

---

[1] Comp. Rev. iii. 16, and the Latin *despuere, respuere.*

[2] In the other Greek writers, besides the simple πτύειν (Soph. *Ant.* 649. 1217), there occur only καταπτύειν τινός, ἀποπτύειν τινά (4 Macc. iii. 18 ; Eur. *Troad.* 668, *Hec.* 1265 ; Hes. ἔργ. 724), and διαπτύειν τινά (in Philo also παραπτύειν) in this *metaphorical* sense (Kypke, II. p. 280 ; Ruhnk. *Ep. crit.* p 149 ; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 17) ; but ἐκπτύειν is always used in the *proper* sense (Hom. *Od.* v. 322 ; Aristoph. *Vesp.* 792 ; Anthol. Theodorid. 2 ; Apoll. Rhod. 478), as also ἐμπτύειν τινί (Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 17). Even in the passage quoted by Kypke, Plut. *de fort. vel virt. Alex.* I. p. 328, it is used in the *proper* sense, because ὥσπερ χαλινόν stands beside it.

[3] In opposition to Wieseler.

[4] In opposition to Fritzsche.

[5] So Bengel, Koppe, Winer, Matthias, and Schott. Schott, in opposition to the context, and all the more strangely seeing that he does not even read ἦν, but merely supplies it, lays stress upon this ἦν : *illo tempore, nunc non item,* "at that time, not now in like manner ;" comp. Oecumenius.

---

[1] Comp. Plat. *Rep.* p. 590 D.

[2] Matthias.

[3] Jerome, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius.

[4] Estius, Locke, Michaelis.

[5] Erasmus, Luther, Piscator, Homberg, Calovius, comp. Olsh.

[6] In the *Annal. d. gesammt. theol. Lit.* 1831, p. 276.

[7] Lomler and Schott trace back the alleged disease of the eyes to the blindness at Damascus, and identify it with the σκόλοψ (2 Cor. xii. 7). The latter idea is just as mistaken as the former. For the σκόλοψ was, in the apostle's view, an operation of *Satan*, whereas the blindness at Damascus arose from the effulgence of the celestial *Christ*. And this blindness, as it had arisen supernaturally, was also supernaturally removed (Acts ix. 17, 18). That a chronic malady of the eyes should have been left behind, would be entirely opposed to the analogy of the N. T. miracles of healing, of which a *complete* cure was always the characteristic.

[8] See Judg. xvi. 21 ; 1 Sam. xi. 2 ; Herod. viii. 116 ; Joseph. *Antt.* vi. 5. 1 ; Wetstein, *in loc.*

Ver. 16. Ὥστε] *Accordingly;* the actual state of things which, to judge from the cooling down—which that painful question (*τίς οὖν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν*;) bewails—in the self-sacrificing love depicted in vv. 14, 15, must have superseded this love, and must now subsist.[2] The words contain a profoundly melancholy exclamation : "Accordingly, that is my position ; I am become your enemy !" etc. So great a change has the relation, previously so rich and happy in confidence and love, experienced *by the fact that it is my business to speak the truth to you* (mark the *present* participle ἀληθεύων). This conduct which I pursue towards you, instead of confirming your inclination towards me and confidence in me, has taken them away ; I have become your *enemy!* To place (with Matthias) a note of interrogation after γέγονα, and then to take ἀληθ. ὑμῖν as an exclamation (an enemy, *who tells you the truth!*), breaks up the passage without adequate ground. Utterly groundless, illogical, and unprecedented (for the ὥστε of an inferential sentence always follows the sentence which governs it) is the inversion forced upon the apostle by Hofmann, who makes out that ὥστε κ.τ.λ. is dependent on ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς : "*so that I am now your enemy, if I tell you truth, they court you ;*" it is the result of these courtings, that, when the apostle agreeably to the truth tells his converts (as in i. 8 f.) what is to be thought about the teaching of his opponents (?), he thereby comes to stand as their enemy. In this interpretation the special reference of ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν is purely gratuitous. To explain the ὥστε *consecutivum* with the *indicative*, the simple rule is quite sufficient, that it is used *de re facta ;* and the emphasis of the relation which it introduces lies in its indicating the *quality* of the preceding, to which the *consecutivum* refers.[3] Hofmann increases the arbitrary character of his artificial exposition by subsequently, in ver. 17, separating οὐ καλῶς from ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, and looking upon these words as an opinion placed alongside of ὥστε ἐχθρ. ὑμ. γέγ., respecting this mode of courting. His interpretation thus presents at once a violent combination and a violent separation. — ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν] The context permits either the *passive* sense : *hated by you*,[4] or the *active : your ene-*

---

[1] See Hermann, *ad Soph. El.* 902 ; *de part.* ἄν, p. 70 ff. ; Bremi, *ad Lys. Exc.* IV. p. 439 f. ; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Symp.* p. 198 C ; Buttmann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 490. But Ellendt (*Lex. Soph.* I. p. 125) well remarks, "Sed cavendum, ne in discrimine utriusque generis, quod pertenue est, constituendo argutemur," "But care must be taken, lest in maintaining the distinction between the two classes, we prate about what is excessively subtile."

[2] ὥστε cannot *specify a reason*, as Wieseler thinks, who, anticipating ver. 17, explains : "For no other reason than because ye pronounced yourselves so happy *on my account*, am I (*according to the representation of the false teachers*) become your enemy," etc. Wieseler therefore takes ὥστε, as if it had been διὰ τοῦτο.

[3] Comp. Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 1012 : "Rem *qualis* sit, addita *rei consequentis significatione* definit," "It defines a subject as to its nature, by adding the meaning of that which results."

[4] De Wette, Windischmann, and older expositors.

my;[1] the latter, however, so taken that ἐχθρ. ὑμῶν γέγονα is said in accordance with the (altered) *opinion of the readers.* This active interpretation is to be preferred, because the usage among Greek authors (and throughout the N. T. also) in respect to the substantive ἐχθρός *with the genitive* is decisive in its favor.[2] From the time of Homer, ἐχθρός means *hated* only with the *dative*,[3] which either stands beside it or is to be mentally supplied.[4] — γέγονα] To *what time* does this change (*having become*), which by the *perfect* is marked as *continuing*, refer? It did not occur in consequence of the *present epistle*,[5] for the Galatians had not as yet read it; nor *at the first visit*, for he had then experienced nothing but abundant love. It must therefore have taken place *at the second visit*,[6] when Paul found the Galatian churches already inclined to Judaism, and in conformity with the truth could no longer praise them (for only ἐπαινέτης τοῦ δικαίου ἀληθεύει, "a commender of what is just speaks the truth," Plat. *Pol.* ix. p. 589 C), but was compelled to blame their aberrations. — ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν] For "*veritas odium parit*," "truth begets hatred,"[7] and ὀργίζονται ἅπαντες τοῖς μετὰ παῤῥησίας τ' ἀληθῆ λέγουσι, "All are provoked with those who frankly speak the truth."[8] As to ἀληθεύειν, *to speak the truth*, see on Eph. iv. 15.

Ver. 17. The self-seeking conduct of the Judaizing teachers (i. 7), so entirely opposed to the ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν. The fact *that they are not named* is quite in keeping with the emotion and irritation of the moment; "nam solemus suppresso nomine de iis loqui, quos nominare piget ac taedet," "For those whom it disgusts and offends us to mention we generally refer to with a suppression of the name," Calvin. — ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς] that is, they exert themselves urgently to win you over to their side; they pay their court to you zealously.[9] For the contrast to the behavior *of the apostle* harmonizes well with this sense; which is also accordant with linguistic usage, since ζηλόω with the accusative means *to be zealous about a person or thing*, and obtains in each case the more precise definition of its import from the context.[10] Next to this interpretation comes that of Calvin, Beza, and others, including Rückert:[11] *they are jealous of you* (2 Cor. xi. 2; Ecclus. ix. 1). Taking it so, it would not be necessary to conceive of Paul and his opponents under the figure of wooers of the bride,[12] of which nothing is suggested by the context; but it may be urged against this explanation, that ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε is not appropriate in the same sense. This remark also applies to the interpretation of Koppe and Reithmayr:[13] "*they envy you* (Acts vii. 9), are full of an envious jealousy of your freedom ;" and to that of Chrysostom and Theophylact : *they vie with you.*[1] The *factitive* explanation : *they make you to be zealous* (Matthias), is opposed to linguistic usage, which only sanctions παραζηλόω], and not the simple verb, in this sense. — οὐ καλῶς] *not in a morally fair, honorable way*, as would have been the case, if it had been done for your real good. — ἐκκλεῖσαι] *To exclude ;*[2] they desire to *debar you ;* in this lies the *wickedness* of their ζῆλος. The question which arises here, and cannot be set aside (as Hofmann thinks) : Exclude *from what?* is answered by the emphatic αὐτούς which follows, namely, *from other teachers*, who do not belong to their clique.[3] These "other teachers" are naturally those of anti-Judaizing views, and consequently Paul himself and his followers ; but the hypothesis that Paul *only* is referred to[4] is the less feasible, as the very idea of ἐκκλεῖσαι in itself most naturally points to a plurality, to an association. Since the αὐτούς which follows applies to the false teachers as *teachers*, we must not conceive the *exclusion*[5] as *from the whole body of Christians*, nor[6] as *from all Christians thinking differently ;* comp. Hilgenfeld : "from the Pauline *church-union.*" It is arbitrarily taken by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, as exclusion from the *state of true knowledge ;* by Erasmus and Cornelius à Lapide, from *Christian freedom ;* by Luther (1519), *a Christo et fiducia ejus*, "*from Christ and confidence in him ;*" by Matthies, from *the kingdom of truth ;*[7] by Wieseler and Reithmayr, from *the kingdom of heaven ;* by Matthias, from *salvation by faith.* All interpretations of this nature would have needed some more precise definition. Koppe falls into a peculiar error : "a consuetudine et familiaritate *sua* arcere vos volunt," "They would preclude you from their companionship and intimacy" (ii. 12). — ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε] As ἵνα is used here with the present *indicative*, it cannot mean *in order that ;*[8] but must be the particle of *place, ubi.*[9] This *ubi* may, however, mean either : *in which position of things* ye are zealous *for them ;*[10] or, in its *purely local* sense : "they wish to debar you *there, where* you are zealous

---

[1] Vulgate, Beza, Grotius, and many others; also Rückert, Matthies, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Hofmann.

[2] Dem. 439. 19. 1121. 12; Xen. *Anab.* iii. 2. 5, *de venat.* 13. 12; Soph. *Aj.* 554.

[3] Xen. *Cyrop.* v. 4. 50; Dem. 241. 12. 245. 16; Lucian, *Sacrif.* 1; Herodian. iii. 10. 6.

[4] Rom. v. 10, xi. 28; Col. i. 21.

[5] Jerome, Luther, Koppe, Flatt, and others.

[6] Acts xviii. 23.

[7] Terent. *Andr.* i. 1. 40.

[8] Lucian, *Abdic.* 7.

[9] So, correctly, Erasmus, Castalio, Er. Schmid, Michaelis, and others, including Flatt, Winer, Usteri, Schott, Fritzsche, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler, and Hofmann.

[10] Dem. 1402. 20. 500. 2; Prov. xxiv. 1; Wisd. i. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 31; and see Wetstein.

[11] Comp. Vulgate: *aemulantur*.

[12] The bridegroom being Christ; see on 2 Cor. xi. 2.

[13] Following Ambrose, Jerome, and Theodoret.

---

[1] Comp. Borger ; ζῆλος μέν ἐστιν ἀγαθὸς ὅταν τις ἀρετὴν μιμῆταί τινος, ζῆλος δὲ οὐ καλὸς, ὅταν τις σπεύδῃ ἐκβαλεῖν τῆς ἀρετῆς τὸν κατορθοῦντα, "Zeal is good when one imitates the excellence of another ; but it is not good when one is eager to reject, because of his virtue, one who is successful " (Theophylact).

[2] Syr. translates *includere*, and consequently read ἐγκλεῖσαι. This would mean : *they desire to include you* in their circle, so that ye should not get free from them and come to associate with other teachers. Thus, in point of fact, the same sense would result as in the case of ἐκκλεῖσαι, only regarded from a different point of view. Fritzsche's reference of ἐγκλ. to the *legis Mos. carcerem* is not suggested by the context. The reading is altogether so weakly attested, that it can only be looked upon as an ancient error of transcription.

[3] The wish expressed by Erasmus in his *Annott.:* "Utinam hodie nulli sint apud Christianos in quos competat haec Pauli querimonia !" "Would that to-day there were none to whom this complaint of Paul were not pertinent!" is still but too applicable to the present day.

[4] "A me meique communione," "from me and fellowship with me," Winer ; so also Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, Kypke, Michaelis, Rückert, Olshausen, Reiche, and others.

[5] With Borger and Flatt.

[6] With Schott.

[7] Comp. Ewald : from *genuine Christianity.*

[8] ζηλοῦτε is not the *Attic future* (Jatho). See Winer, p. 72 ; Buttmann, p. 33. In Thuc. ii. 8. 3, and iii. 58. 4, ἐλευθεροῦσι and ἐρημοῦτε are *presents ;* see Krüger *in loc.*

[9] Valckenaer, *ad Herod.* ix. 27 : ἵνα δοκέει κ.τ.λ.

[10] My former explanation, as in 1 Cor. iv. 6 ; see on that passage, and Ellendt, *Lex. Soph* I. p. 839.

for them,"—namely, in the *Judaistic circle,* in which it is *they themselves* who are zealously courted by you, whose favor you have to seek, etc. The latter view, as the simplest, is to be preferred. On the usual explanation of ἵνα as a *particle of design,* recourse is had to the assumption of an abnormal construction of degenerate Greek;[1] or of a mistake on the part of the author or of the transcriber;[2] or, with Fritzsche, to the reading ζηλῶτε.[3] But all these expedients are quite as arbitrary as the assumption of a faulty formation of mood.[4] The interpretation of ἵνα as *ubi* is based not on an "exaggerated philological preicison,"[5] but on a linguistic necessity, to which the customary interpretation, yielding certainly a sense appropriate enough in itself, must give way, because the latter *absolutely* requires the *subjunctive* mood. [See Note LXIII., p. 215.]

Ver. 18. Paul knew that the state of things mentioned in ver. 17 was but too assuredly based upon reality. So long as he had been with them (on the first occasion, and still even during his short second visit), the Galatians had shown *zeal in that which was good,* viz., in *the actual case:* zeal *for their apostle and his true gospel,* as was their duty (consequently what was morally right and good). But after his departure this zeal veered round in favor of the Judaizing teachers and their doctrine. Hence the apostle continues, giving a gentle reproof, and for that reason expressing the first half of the sentence merely in a general form: "*Good, however, is the becoming zealous in a good thing always, and not merely during my presence with you;*" that is, "It is good when zealous endeavors are *continuously* applied in a good cause, and *not merely,*" etc. The chief emphasis rests on this πάντοτε with its antithesis. The special *form,* in which Paul has clothed his thought, arises from his inclination for deliberately using the same word in a modified shade of meaning.[6] But the very *point* of this mode of expression requires that ζηλοῦσθαι should not be taken in a sense *essentially different* from the correct view of it in ver. 17; consequently, neither as *invidiose tractari,* "to be enviously treated" (Koppe), nor as *to endure envy* (Rückert), which, besides, cannot be conveyed by the simple passive. In Usteri's view Paul intends to say, "How much was I not the object of your ζῆλος (zeal and interest), when I was with you! But if it should cease again so soon after my departure from you, it must have lost much of its value." But the very καὶ μὴ μόνον ἐν τῷ παρεῖναί με πρὸς ὑμᾶς plainly shows that Paul did not conceive *himself* as the object of the ζηλοῦσθαι; in order to be understood, he must have added this *με* to *ζηλοῦσθαι*, since there was no previous mention of *himself* as the object of the *ζῆλος*. This objection also applies to the view of Reiche, although the latter takes it more distinctly and sharply: "*Bonum*, honestum et salutare (vi. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 1; 1 Thess. v. 21), *vero est expeti aliorum studio et amore, modo et consilia honesto*, ἐν καλῷ (*conf.* 2 Cor. xi. 2; Θεοῦ ζήλῳ), *idque continuo ac semper* πάντοτε, *nec tantum praesente me inter vos*," "*It is indeed good*, becoming, and advantageous (vi. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 1; 1 Thes. v. 21) to be sought after by the devotion and love of others, in an honorable way and from an honorable purpose (conf. 2 Cor. ii. 2), and that continually and always, nor only when I am present among you." But ἐν καλῷ[1] cannot mean "*modo et consilio* honesto" (this is expressed by *καλῶς* in ver. 17); it denotes the *object* of the *ζηλοῦσθαι*, and that conceived of as the *sphere* in which the *ζηλοῦσθαι* takes place. Schott interprets, unsuitably to the *καὶ μὴ μόνον κ.τ.λ.* which follows: "Laudabile est, *quovis tempore appeti vel trahi ad partes alicujus*, si agitur de bono et honesto colendo," "It is praiseworthy at any time to be eager for or to be drawn to the interest of one, provided it be done for the purpose of cultivating the good and honorable." So also, in substance, de Wette, with relation to the passive demeanor of the Galatians, and with an extension of the idea of the verb: "*It is, however, beautiful to be the object of zealous attention in what is good*," by which are indicated the qualities and advantages on account of which people are admired, loved, and courted.[2] Similarly Ewald: "It is beautiful *to be the object of zealous love* in what is beautiful," *ζηλοῦσιν* and *ζηλοῦτε* in ver. 17 being understood in a corresponding sense. But this interpretation also does not harmonize with the *καὶ μὴ μόνον κ.τ.λ.* which follows; and hence Ewald changes the idea of *ζηλοῦσθαι* into that of *being worthy* of love, and consequently into the sense of *ζηλωτὸν εἶναι*. Hofmann over-refines and obscures the correct apprehension of the passage, by bringing ver. 18, in consequence of his erroneous reference of *ὥστε ἐχθρὸς κ.τ.λ.* (see on ver. 16), into connection with this sentence, considering the idea to be: "Just as his person had formerly been the object of their affection, it ought to have remained so, instead of his now being their enemy in consequence of the self-seeking solicitude with which his opponents take pains about them if he speaks to them the truth. For in his case the morally good had been the ground, on account of which he had been the object of their loving exertion," etc. The earlier expositors,[3] as also Olshausen and Matthias (the latter in keeping with his factitive interpretation of the active), mostly take ζηλοῖσθαι as *middle*, in sense equivalent to ζηλοῦν, with very different definitions of the meaning,[1] but inconsistently with the *usus loquendi.*

---

[1] Winer, Olshausen, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, and others.

[2] Schott.

[3] Which only 113 and 219** have.

[4] Rückert, Matthies.

[5] As Hilgenfeld thinks, who appeals in favor of ἵνα, *ut,* with the indicative to Clem. *Hom.* xi. 16: ἵνα μηδὲν τῶν προσκυνουμένων ὑπῆρχεν. This is certainly not "philological precision," but inattention to linguistic fact; for in this Clementine passage the quite customary ἵνα, *ut,* is used with the indicative of the *preterite,* "quod tum fit, quando ponitur aliquid, quod erat futurum, si aliud quid factum esset, sed jam non est factum," "which occurs when anything which was to be is stated, if anything else was to have been done, but now has not been done." Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 630 f.; Herm. *ad Viger.* p. 850 f.; Kühner, II. § 778. With regard to the respective passages from Barnabas and Ignatius, in support of ἵνα with the present indicative, see on 1 Cor. iv. 6.

[6] Rom. xiv. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 17, *et al.;* comp. Wilke, *Rhetor.* p. 343 f.

---

[1] Ἐν καλῷ, used adverbially, means either at the fit *time* (Plat. *Pol.* ix. p. 571 B; Xen. *Hell.* iv. 3. 5), or at the suitable *place* (Xen. *Hell.* ii. 1. 25), and in general, *fitly* (see Sturz, *Lex. Xen.* II. p. 643), but does not occur in the N. T.

[2] Theophylact (comp. also Chrysostom and Theodoret) has evidently understood the passage substantively, just as de Wette: τοῦτο αἰνίττεται, ὡς ἄρα ζηλωτοὶ ἦσαν πᾶσιν ἐπὶ τῇ τελειότητι, "This suggests that, therefore, they were enviable as to their perfection." Linguistically unobjectionable. Comp. Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1. 19: ἐπαινομένους κ. ζηλουμένους ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων, "praised and esteemed happy by the rest." *Sympos.* 4. 45; *Hiero*, 1. 9; Eur. *Alc.* 903; Soph. *El.* 1016; Aesch. *Pers.* 698; Plat. *Gorg.* p. 473 C, ζηλωτὸς ὢν καὶ εὐδαιμονιζόμενος, "being enviable and accounted happy." See generally, Blomf. *Gloss. Aesch. Prom.* 338; Pierson, *ad Moer.* p. 169.

[3] Not all. The learned Grotius has evidently understood it *passively*: "Rectum erat, ut semper operam daretis, ut ego a vobis amari expeterem; est enim hoc

Ver. 19. This verse is not be attached to the preceding,[2] —a construction which makes this earnest, touching address appear awkward and dissimilar in character to what is previously said,—but the words are to be separated from what precedes by a full stop, and to be joined with what follows, the tender affection of which is quite in harmony with this loving address. Difficulty has been felt as to δέ in ver. 20 ;[3] but only from inattention to the Greek use of δέ after the address, when the writer turns to a new thought, and does so with a tacit anthithesis, which is to be recognized from the context. It is found so not merely with questions,[4] but also in other instances.[5] Here the slight antithetic reference lies, as the very repetition of παρεῖναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς indicates, in his glancing back to καὶ μὴ μόνον κ.τ.λ., namely : "Although zeal in a good cause ought not to be restricted merely to my presence with you, I yet would wish to be now present with you," etc. The δέ *of the apodosis*, which Wieseler here assumes, is not suitable, because ἤθελον δέ κ.τ.λ. does not stand in any kind of antithesis to τεκν. μου οὓς πάλ. ὠδίνω κ.τ.λ. ; and besides, no connected construction would result from it ; for the idea : "*Because* ye are my children . . . I would wish," does

---

amari honestum," "It was right for you always to take pains that I might aspire to be loved of you; for it is good to be loved." Also Michaelis (comp. Er. Schmidt): "It is good when *others* court our favor." Both interpretations come very near to that of Usteri.

[1] Erasmus, *Paraphr.*, "Vidistis me legis ceremonias negligere, nihil praedicare praeter Christum, aemulabamini praesentem. Si id rectum erat, cur nunc absente me vultis alios aemulare in iis, quae recta non sunt?" "You saw that I neglected the ceremonies of the law, that I preached nothing but Christ, and you emulated me when I was present. If this was right, why, now, in my absence do you wish to emulate others in such things as are not right." Luther, 1524 : "Bonum quidem est aemulari et imitari alios, sed hoc praestate in re bona semper, nunquam in mala, non tantum me praesente, sed etiam absente," "It is good indeed to emulate and imitate others, but do this always in a good matter, never in an evil, not only in my presence, but also in my absence " Comp. Calvin · "Imitari vel eniti ad alterius virtutem," "To imitate or strive after the virtue of another." Beza : "At noster amor longe est alius ; vos enim bonam ob causam non ad tempus, sed semper, non solum praesens, sed etiam absens absentes vehementissime complector," "But our love is far different ; for in a good cause I most ardently embrace you, not for a time, but always ; not only when I am present, but also when I am absent, do I embrace you absent." Locke (ἐν καλῷ *masculine*): "Vos amabatis me praesentem tanquam bonum, fas itaque est idem facere in absentem," "You loved me when present as a good ; therefore it is right to do the same towards me absent." Bengel : "Zelo zelum accendere, zelare *inter se*," "To kindle zeal by zeal, to be mutually zealous." Morus : "Laudabile autem est, sectari praeceptorem in re bona semper, neque solum," etc., "It is, moreover, praiseworthy always in a good matter to follow a teacher, nor only," etc. ; substantially, therefore, as Erasmus. Others interpret in various ways. Olshausen : "Paul desires to make known that he finds the zeal of the Galatians in itself very praiseworthy, and certainly would not damp it ; and he therefore says, that the being zealous is good if it takes place on account of a good cause, and is maintained not merely in his presence, but also in his absence." So already Calovius and others.

[2] Bos, Bengel, Knapp, Lachmann, Rückert, Usteri, Schott, Ewald, Hofmann.

[3] Which therefore is omitted in Chrysostom and some min.

[4] Hom. *Il.* xv. 244 ; Plat. *Legg.* x. p. 890 E ; Xen. *Mem.* i. 3. 13, ii. 1. 26 ; Soph. *O. C.* 323. 1459.

[5] Herod. i. 115 ; Xen. *Anab.* v. 5. 13, vi. 6 12.

not correspond with the words. According to Hilgenfeld, that which the address is intended to introduce (viz., to move the readers to return) is wholly *suppressed*, and is supposed to be thereby the more strikingly suggested.[1] But the affectionate tenor of the wish which follows in ver. 20 harmonizes so fully with the tender address in ver. 19, that that hypothesis, which Calvin also entertained ("hic quasi moerore exanimatus in medio sententiae tractu deficit," "here as though stupefied by grief, he loses courage right in the midst of the delivering of his judgment"), does not seem warranted. Nevertheless Buttmann also[2] assumes an anacoluthon. — τεκνία μου] The word τεκνία, so frequent in *John*, is not found elsewhere in *Paul's* writings. But Lachmann and Usteri ought not to have adopted (following B F G ℵ*) the reading τέκνα, since it is just in this passage, where Paul compares himself to a mother in childbirth, that the phrase "my *little children*" finds a more special motive and warrant than in any other passage where he uses τέκνα.[3]— οὓς] The well-known *constructio* κατὰ σύνεσιν, "construction according to sense."[4] — πάλιν ὠδίνω] whom I *once more travail with.* Paul represents himself, not, as elsewhere (1 Cor. iv. 15 ; Philem. 10), as a *father*, but in the special emotion of his love, as a *mother* who is in travail, and whose labor is not brought to an end (by the actual final birth) until nothing further is requisite for the full and mature formation of the τεκνίον. So long as this object is not attained, according to the figurative representation, the ὠδίνειν still continues.[5] Bengel remarks very correctly : "*Loquitur ut res fert*, nam in partu naturali formatio est *ante* dolores partus," "He speaks as the case demands, for in natural birth formation precedes the pains of birth." The *point of comparison* is the *loving exertion, which perseveres amidst trouble and pain in the effort to bring about the new Christian life.* This metaphorical ὠδίνειν had been on the first occasion easy and joyful, ver. 13 ff. (although it had not had the full and lasting result ; see afterwards, on ἄχρις οὗ κ.τ.λ.) ; but on this second occasion it was severe and painful, and on this account the word ὠδίνω is chosen (and not τίκτω or γεννῶ), which, however, is also appropriate to the earlier act of bearing intimated in πάλιν, since the idea of pains is essential to the conception of a birth, however slight and short they may be. The *sense*, when *stripped of figure*, is : "My beloved disciples ! at whose conversion I am laboring for the second time with painful and loving exertion, until ye shall have become maturely-formed Christians." This continuous οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω is to be conceived as begun, so soon as Paul had learned the apostasy of his readers and had commenced to counteract it ; so that his operations during his second visit[6] are thus also included : hence we cannot[7] consider vv. 18, 19 as intimating that Paul had only *once* visited Galatia. According to Wieseler, *πάλιν ὠδίνω* is intended to express the idea of the *παλιγγενεσία*, "regeneration," Tit. iii. 5; Paul had regenerated his readers already at their conversion, and here says that he is *still continuously* occupied in their regeneration, until they should have attained the goal of perfection on the part of the Christian—similarity with Christ. This is incorrect, because *πάλιν* must necessarily denote a *second* act of travail on the part of *Paul*. Paul certainly effected the regeneration of his readers on occasion of the first *ὠδίνειν*, which is presupposed by *πάλιν*; but because they had relapsed (i. 6, iii. 1, iv. 9 f., *et al.*), he must be *for the second time* in travail with them, and not merely *still continuously* (an idea which is not expressed) their *re*generator, so that the idea of the *πάλιν*, the repetition, would be on the part of the *readers*. Theophylact[1] aptly defines the sense of *πάλιν ὠδίνω* not as that of a continued *ἀναγέννησις*, "new birth," but as that of *πάλιν ἑτέρας ἀναγεννήσεως*, "again another new birth." The sense, "whose regeneration I am continuing," would have been expressed by Paul in some such form as *οὓς οὐ παύομαι ἀναγεννῶν*, "whom I do not cease to beget anew," or *οὓς ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἀναγεννῶ*, "whom even now I am begetting anew."—*ἄχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν*] A *shadow* is thus thrown on the result of the *first* conversion (birth), which had undergone so sudden a change (i. 6). The reiterated labor of birth is not to cease until, etc. This meaning, and along with it the emphasis of the *ἄχρις οὗ κ.τ.λ.*, has been missed by Hofmann, who, instead of referring *πάλιν* to *ὠδίνω* only, extends it also to *ἄχρις οὗ κ.τ.λ.* In connection with the general scope of the passage, however, the stress is on *μορφωθῇ*: "until Christ shall have been *formed*, shall have attained His due conformation, in you," that is, *until ye shall have attained to the fully-formed inner life of the Christian.* For the state of "Christ having been formed in man" is by no means realized "*so soon as a man becomes a Christian*,"[2] but, as clearly appears from the notion of the *ἄχρις οὗ*, is the *goal of development* which the process of becoming Christian has to *reach*. When this goal is attained, the Christian is he *in whom Christ lives* (comp. on ii. 20); as, for instance, on Paul himself the specific form of life of his Master was distinctly stamped. So long, therefore, as the Galatians were not yet developed and morally shaped into this complete inward frame, they were still like to an immature embryo, the internal parts of which have not yet acquired their normal shape, and which cannot therefore as yet come to the birth and so put an end to the *ὠδίνειν*. In the Christian, Christ is to inhabit the heart (Eph. iii. 17): in him there is to be the *νοῦς*, "*mind*," of Christ (1 Cor. ii. 16), the *πνεῦμα*, "*spirit*," of Christ (Rom. viii. 9), the *σπλάγχνα*, "bowels," of Christ (Phil. i. 8); and the body and its members are to be the body and members of Christ (1 Cor. vi. 13, 15). All this, which is comprehended in the idea Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, is in our passage rendered intelligible by the representation that Christ is to be *formed* in us, or to become present in the life-form corresponding to His nature. This view is not different in reality, although it is so in the mode of representation, from that of spiritual transformation after the *image* of Christ (2 Cor. iii. 18); for, according to our passage, *Christ Himself* is in Christians the subject of the specific development. Bengel, moreover, well remarks: "*Christus* non Paulus, in Galatis formandus," "Christ, not Paul, is to be formed in the Galatians."—μορφόω] occurs here only in the N. T.; but see LXX. Isa. xliv. 13 (ed. Breit.); Symmachus, Ps. xxxiv. 1; Arat. *Phaen.* 375; Lucian, *Prom.* 3; Plut. *de anim. generat.* p. 1013; Theophr. *c. pl.* v. 6, 7.[1]

---

[1] Comp. also Reithmayr.

[2] *Neut. Gr.* p. 331.

[3] 1 Cor. iv. 14 ; 2 Cor. vi. 13 : comp. also 1 Tim. i. 18 ; 2 Tim. ii. 1.

[4] Winer, p. 133.

[5] Heinsius, Grotius, Koppe, Rückert, and others, erroneously hold that ὠδίνειν here means *to be pregnant*, which it *never* does, not even in the LXX., Isa. xxvi. 17 ; Ps. vii. 15 ; Song of Sol. viii. 5 ; Philo, *quod Deus immut.* p. 313 B ; Plat. *Theaet.* p. 148 C, 210 B. On ὠδίνειν with the accusative of the person, comp. *parturire aliquem*, Isa. li. 2 ; Song of Sol. viii. 5 ; Eur. *Iph. A.* 1234.

[6] Comp ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν, ver. 16.

[7] With Fritzsche (*l.c.* p. 244) and Ulrich (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, p. 459).

---

[1] Comp. Chrysostom.

[2] Hofmann.

Ver. 20. As to the connection of thought of the δέ with ver. 18, see on ver. 18.—ἤθελον] namely, if the thing were possible.[2]—ἄρτι] *just now, presently* (see on i. 9), has the emphasis.—ἀλλάξαι τὴν φωνήν μου] The emphasis is on ἀλλάξαι. But in harmony with the context (see vv. 16, 18, and the foregoing ἄρτι), this *changing* can only refer to the *second visit* of the apostle to the Galatians, not to the language now employed in his letter, as many expositors think.[3] Erroneously, therefore—and how sharply in opposition to the previous affectionate address!—Ambrosius, Pelagius, Wetstein, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Rückert, Baumgarten-Crusius, take the sense to be: *to assume a stern language of reproof.* Hofmann also erroneously holds that Paul means the (in oral expression) *more chastened tone* of a *didactic statement*—aiming at the bringing the readers back from their error—after the strongly excited style in which, since the word θαυμάζω in i. 6, he had urged his readers, as one who had already been almost deprived of the fruit of his labors. As if Paul had not previously, and especially from iii. 6 to iv. 7, written didactically enough; and as if he had not also in the sequel (see immediately, ver. 21, and chap. v. and vi. down to the abrupt dismissal at the end) urged his readers with excitement enough! The supposition, however, which Hofmann entertains, that Paul has hitherto been answering a *letter* of the Galatians, and has just at this point *come to the end of it*, is nothing but a groundless hypothesis, for there is no trace of such a letter to be found in the epistle. No; when Paul was for the second time in Galatia, he had spoken sharply and sternly, and this had made his readers suspect him, as if he had become their enemy (ver. 16): hence he wishes to be now with them, and *to speak to them with a voice different from what he had then used*, that is, to speak to them in a *soft and gentle tone.*[4] By this, of course, he means not any deviation in the substance of his teaching from the ἀληθεύειν (ver. 16), but a manner of language betokening tender, mother-like love. A wish of self-denying affection, which is ready and willing, in the service of the cause and for the salvation of the persons concerned, to change form and tone, although retaining *φωνὰν ψευδέων ἀγνωστόν*, "a voice unexperienced in falsehoods."[1] The latter was a matter of course in the case of a Paul, willingly though he became all things to all men; comp. on 1 Cor. ix. 22. Many other expositors[2] understand it as: *to speak according to the circumstances of each case, with tenderness and affection to one, with severity and censure to another.* Comp. Corn. à Lapide: "ut scilicet quasi mater nunc blandirer, nunc gemerem, nunc obsecrarem, nunc objurgarem vos," "namely, that, as a mother now I might caress, now sigh over, now beseech and now chide you." But this cannot be expressed by the *mere* *ἀλλάξαι τ. φ.*, which without addition means nothing more than *to change* the voice,[3] that is, to assume *another* voice, to let oneself be heard *otherwise*, not *differently*.[4] Paul must have added either a more precise definition, such as *εἰς πολλοὺς τρόπους, εἰς μορφὰς πλείονας*, "into many ways, various forms,"[5] or at least some such expression as *πρὸς τὴν χρείαν* (Acts xxviii. 10), *πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον* (1 Cor. xii. 7), *πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ* (Heb. v. 14). Fritzsche incorrectly interprets it: *to adopt some other voice, so that ye may believe that ye are listening to some other teacher, and not to the hated Paul.* What a strange, unseemly idea, not at all in keeping with the thoughtful manner of the apostle! According to Wieseler, the sense intended is: *to exchange my speaking with you;* that is, to enter into *mutual discourse* with you, in order most surely to learn and to obviate your counter-arguments. But in this view "*with you*" is a pure interpolation, although it would be essentially requisite to the definition of the sense; and *ἀλλάσσειν λόγους*, to say nothing of *ἀλλ. φωνήν*, is never so used. What Wieseler means is expressed by *ἀμείβεσθαί τινα λόγοις*, "to answer one in words,"[6] *προσδιαλέγεσθαί τινι*, "to answer one in conversation,"[7] *συζητεῖν τινι*, or *πρός τινα*, "to dispute with one,"[8] *λόγους ἀντιβάλλειν πρός*, "to have communication with,"[9] *δοῦναί τε καὶ ἀποδέξασθαι λόγον*, "to give and to receive an account" (Plat. *Rep.* p. 531 E). — *ὅτι ἀποροῦμαι ἐν ὑμῖν*] justifies the wish of *ἀλλάξαι τὴν φων. μου*. The usual interpretation is the correct one: *I am perplexed about you;* *ἐν ὑμῖν* is to be taken as in the phrase *θαῤῥῶ ἐν ὑμῖν*, "I have confidence in you," 2 Cor. vii. 16, so that the perplexity is conceived as inherent in the readers, dependent on their condition as its cause (comp. also i. 24). The perplexity consists in this, that he at the time knows no certain ways and means by which he shall effect their re-conversion (ver. 19); and this instils the wish (*ὅτι*) that he could now be present with them, and, in place of the severe tone which at the preceding visit had had no good effect (ver. 16), could try the experiment of an altered and milder tone. The form ἀποροῦμαι is, moreover,[1] to be taken *passively* (as a middle form with a passive signification), so that the state of the ἀπορεῖν is conceived of as produced on the subject, passively.[2] Fritzsche, *l.c.* p. 257, holds the sense to be : "*Nam haeretis, quo me loco habeatis, nam sum vobis suspectus,*" "For ye are embarrassed in what place to have me, since I am suspected of you." Thus ἐν ὑμῖν would be *among you*, and ἀποροῦμαι : *I am an object of perplexity*, according to the well-known Greek use of the personal passive of intransitive verbs.[3] But the sense : "sum vobis *suspectus*" is *interpolated*, and there is no ground for deviating from the use of ἀποροῦμαι throughout the N.T. ;[4] as, indeed, the idea "*sum vobis suspectus*," "I am suspected of you," cannot give any suitable motive for the wish of the ἀλλάξαι τὴν φωνήν, unless we adopt Fritzsche's erroneous interpretation of ἀλλάξαι. To disconnect[5] ἐν ὑμῖν from ἀποροῦμαι, and attach it to ἀλλάξ. τ. φωνήν μου, would yield an addition entirely superfluous after παρεῖναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, and leave ἀποροῦμαι without any more precise definition of its bearing. And the proposal to attach ὅτι ἀπορ. ἐν ὑμῖν as protasis to the following λέγετέ μοι[6] would have the effect of giving to the λέγ. μοι, which stands forth sternly and peremptorily, an enfeebling background.

---

[1] See also Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VI. p. 345.

[2] Comp. Rom. ix. 3; Acts xxv. 22. See Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Gorg.* p. 235; Kühner, II. p. 68; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 245.

[3] So also Zachariae (who is followed by Flatt): "to lay aside my present mournful language, and to adopt that of tenderness and contentment." In this case Paul must have used δύνασϑαι; for unless his readers had improved in their conduct, it would have been *impossible* for him to speak contentedly. Bengel, in opposition to the idea of ἀλλάξαι: "molliter scribit, sed mollius loqui vellet," "He writes mildly; but he would wish to speak still more mildly." Jerome explained the passage as referring to the exchange of the *vox epistolica*, "epistolic utterance," for the *vivus sermo*, "living speech," of actual presence, which might have more effect in bringing them back *ad veritatem*, "to the truth."

[4] Not exactly *weeping*, as Chrysostom thinks: ποιῆσαι καὶ δακρύα καὶ πάντα εἰς ϑρῦνον ἐπισπάσασϑαι, "to shed tears, and to turn all things to lamentation."

---

[1] Pind. *Ol.* vi. 112.

[2] As Theodoret, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Estius, Koppe, Borger, Winer, Matthies, Schott, de Wette.

[3] Comp. ἀλλάττειν χώραν, Plat. *Parm.* p. 139 A; εἶδος, Eur. *Bacch.* 53; χρῶμα, Eur. *Phoen.* 1252; στολάς, Gen. xxxv. 2.

[4] See Artem. ii. 20, iv. 56; Dio Chrysostom, lix. p. 575, in Wetstein. Comp. Rom. i. 23; Wisd. iv. 11, xii. 10; frequently in the LXX.

[5] Lucian, *Vit. Auct.* 5.

[6] Hom. *Od.* iii. 148, *et al.*

[7] Plat. *Theaet.* p. 161 B.

[8] Acts vi. 9; Luke xxii. 23.

[9] Luke xxiv. 17.

Vv. 21–30. Now, at the conclusion of the theoretical portion of his epistle, Paul adds a quite peculiar antinomistic disquisition,—a *learned Rabbinico-allegorical argument derived from the law itself*,—calculated to annihilate the influence of the pseudo-apostles with their own weapons, and to root them out on their own ground.

Ver. 21, without any connecting link, leads most energetically[7] at once *in mediam rem.* On the λέγετέ μοι, so earnestly intensifying the question, comp. Bergler, *ad Aristoph. Acharn.* 318. — οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον κ.τ.λ.] *Ye who wish to be under the law.* This refers to the Judaistically inclined readers, who, partly Gentiles and partly Jewish Christians, led astray by the false teachers (i. 7), supposed that in faith they had not enough for salvation, and desired to be subject to the law (ver. 9), towards which they had already made a considerable beginning (ver. 10).[8] — τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε ;] *Hear ye not the law?* Is it not *read in your hearing?*[9] The public reading of the venerated divine Scriptures of the law and the prophets, after the manner of the synagogues,[10] took place in the assemblies for worship of the Christian churches both of Jewish and of Gentile origin : they contained, in fact, the revelation of God, of which Christianity is the fulfilment, and an acquaintance with them was justly considered as a source of the Christian knowledge of salvation ;

---

[1] Comp. ἀπορηθείς, Dem. 830. 2, and ἀπορηθήσεται, Ecclus. xviii. 7.

[2] Schoemann, *ad Isaeum*, p. 192.

[3] Bernhardy, p. 341 ; Kühner, II. p. 34 f. Comp. Xen. *de rep. Lac.* xiii. 7 : ὥστε τῶν δεομένων γίγνεσθαι οὐδὲν ἀπορεῖται, Plat. *Soph.* p. 243 B, *Legg.* vii. p. 799 C.

[4] 2 Cor. iv. 8 ; Luke xxiv. 4 ; Acts xxv. 20 ; John xiii. 22.

[5] With Hofmann.

[6] Matthias.

[7] λέγετέ μοι : "urget quasi praesens," "he urges as though present," Bengel.

[8] Chrysostom aptly remarks : καλῶς εἶπεν· οἱ θέλοντες, οὐ γὰρ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀκολουθίας, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐκείνων ἀκαίρου φιλονεικίας τὸ πρᾶγμα ἦν, "Well does he say : ye who wish, for the subject was not of the succession of things, but of their unseasonable contentiousness."

[9] Comp. John xii. 34 ; 2 Cor. iii. 14.

[10] Rom. ii. 15 ; Acts xv. 21 ; Luke iv. 16.

for its articles of faith (1 Cor. xv. 3 f.) and rules of life (Rom. xiii. 8–10, xv. 4) were to be *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*, "according to the Scriptures." Now the *hearing* of the law must necessarily have taught the Galatians how much they were in error. [See Note LXIV., p. 215.] Hence this question, expressive of astonishment,[1] which is all the stronger and consequently all the more appropriate, the more simply we allow *ἀκούετε* to retain its primary literal signification. Hence we must neither explain it[2] as *audisse*, *i.e.*, *nosse*, *notum habere*, "to have heard, *i.e.*, to know, to be acquainted with ;"[3] nor, with Jerome and many others, including Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Borger, Flatt, Schott, Olshausen, as *to understand*,[4] which Paul conceives as the hearing of the *πνεῦμα* speaking behind the *γράμμα* ;[5] nor, with Erasmus, de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, as *ἀκούειν τινος*, *to give attention*, that is, to bestow moral consideration.[6]—*νόμος* is used here in a twofold sense :[7] it means, in the first place, the *institute of the law ;* and secondly, the *Pentateuch*, according to the division of the Old Test. into *Law*, *Prophets*, and *Hagiographa*.[8] The repetition of the word gives emphasis.

Ver. 22. *Γάρ*] now gives the explanation of and warrant for that question, by citing the history, narrated in the law, of Ishmael and Isaac, the two sons of the ancestor of the theocratic people.[9] — *ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης*] *by the* (well-known) *bondswoman*, *Hagar*.[10] As to the word itself (which might also denote a *free* maiden), see Wetstein, I. p. 526 f. ; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 259 f. — *ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθ.*] *Sarah.*

Ver. 23 presents the relation of diversity between the two, in contrast to the previously mentioned relation of similarity, according to which they both were sons of Abraham. — *κατὰ σάρκα*] *according to the flesh*, so that the birth was the result of a natural carnal intercourse. Differently in Rom. i. 3, ix. 5. — *γεγέννηται*] *is born ;* the *perfect* realizes the historically existing relation as present. — *διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*] *through the* (well-known) *promise*, Gen. xvii. 16, 19, xviii. 10 ; Rom. ix. 9. This must not, however, be rationalized (with Grotius, Rosenmüller, and others) into "per eam vim extraordinariam, quam Deus promiserat," "by that extraordinary power which God had promised," which does violence to the history in Genesis, as above ; nor, with Hofmann, to the effect that the *promise*, with which Abraham had been *called*, was *realized in the procreation itself ;* but it is to be definitely explained in accordance with the tenor of the words and with Gen. xxi. 1 : "*by virtue of the promise* he is born," so that in his procreation (Matt. i. 2 ; Luke iii. 34) the divine promise made to his parents, which had assured them of the birth of a son, was the procuring cause of the result, which would not have occurred without such an operation of the power of the divine promise (Gen. xviii. 14), seeing that the two parents were in themselves incapable of the procreation of Isaac ; for Sarah was barren, and both were already too old (Gen. xviii. 11 ; Rom. iv. 19).[1]

---

[1] Hofmann (comp. also his *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 57) deals with our passage in an unwarrantable and intolerably violent manner by writing οἱ (as *relative*), but makes the summons (*tell me, ye who, wishing to be under the law, do not hear the law*) to be only prepared for by ver. 22 ff., and that which Paul had in view in the λέγετέ μοι of ver. 21 to follow at length in ver. 30. The address runs on simply and appropriately, and affords no occasion for any such intricacy.

[2] With Winer ; comp. Matthies.

[3] See Heind. *ad Plat. Gorg.* p. 503 C ; Ast, *ad Plat. Legg.* i. p. 9 ; Spohn, *Lectt. Theocr.* i. p. 25.

[4] Comp. on 1 Cor. xiv. 2.

[5] So Holsten, *z. Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 382.

[6] Rather, *to have an ear for*, as 1 Cor. xiv. 2 ; Matt. x. 14 ; John viii. 47.

[7] Comp. Rom. iii. 19.

[8] See on Luke xxiv. 44.

[9] See Gen. xvi. 15 f., xxi. 2 f.

[10] See Gen. xvi. 3.

Ver. 24. Ἅτινα] *quippe quae, quae quidem*, "*Surely which things*, or *which things indeed*," taking up the recorded facts under the point of view of a special *quality*. — ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα] *are of allegorical import.* The word ἀλληγορεῖν, not occurring elsewhere in the N. T., means ἄλλο ἀγορεύειν, *so to speak* (to set forth, to relate), *that another sense is expressed than the words convey ;* which *further* meaning lies concealed behind the immediate meaning of what is said.[2] In the *passive : to have an allegorical meaning*,[3] Schol. Soph. *Aj.* 186 ; Porph. *Pyth.* p. 185 ; Philo, *de Cherub.* I. p. 143 ; and see generally, Wetstein.[4] The understanding of the O. T. history in an allegoric sense was, as is well known, extremely prevalent among the later Jews.[5] But on account of the Rabbinical training in which Paul had been brought up,[6] and on account of his truthful character, nothing else can be assumed than that *he himself* was convinced that what he related contained, in addition to its historical sense, the allegorical import set forth by him ; so that he did not intend to give a mere *argumentum* κατ' ἄνθρωπον, "*ad hominem*," but ascribed to his allegory the cogency of objective proof. [See Note LXV., p. 215.] Hence he has raised it into the keystone of his whole antinomistic reasoning, and has so earnestly introduced (ver. 21) and carried it out, that we cannot hold (with Schott) that it was intended to be an *argumentum secundarium, quod insuper accederet*, "a secondary argument to be added besides." But in the view of a faith not associated with Rabbinical training, the *argument* wholly falls to the ground as a real *proof* (Luther says that it is "too weak to *stand the test*") ;[7] while the *thing* proved is none the less established independent of the allegory, and is merely illustrated by it. "Nothing can be more preposterous than the endeavors of interpreters to vindicate the argument of the apostle as one objectively true."[1] — *αὗται*] namely, Hagar and Sarah; for see afterwards *ἥτις ἐστιν Ἄγαρ*. Hence not equivalent to *ταῦτα*, *sc.* *τὰ ἀλληγορούμενα*, "The things allegorized,"[2] as is assumed, in order not to admit here an *εἶναι σημαντικόν*. — *εἰσι*] namely, allegorically, and so far = *signify*.[3] — *δύο διαθῆκαι*] *two covenants*, not: *institutions*, declarations of will,[4] or generally "arrangements connected with the history of salvation" (Hofmann), any more than in iii. 15. The characteristic of a covenant, that there must be two parties, existed actually in the case of the *διαθῆκαι* (God and the men, who were subject to the law,—God and the men, who believe in Christ).[5] — *μία μὲν ἀπὸ ὄρους Σινᾶ*] *One proceeding from Mount Sinai*, which was instituted on Mount Sinai, and therefore issues from it. Instead of *ἀπό*, the mere genitive might have been used,[6] but the former is more definite and descriptive. The *μέν* is without any corresponding *δέ*,[7] for in none of the cases where *δέ* subsequently occurs is it correlative to this *μέν*. In *point of fact* the contrast anticipated in *μία μέν* certainly

---

[1] Comp. Chrysostom.

[2] Hesychius : ἀλληγορία ἄλλο τι παρὰ τὸ ἀκουόμενον ὑποδεικνύουσα, "An allegory indicating something else than what is heard." Comp. Quinctil. viii. 6 ; see Plut. *Mor.* p. 363 D, *Athen.* ii. p. 69 C ; Philo, *de migr. Abr.* p. 420 B ; Joseph *Antt. prooem.* 4

[3] Not : to be the object of allegorical *conception* (Hofmann). The allegorical sense is *à priori* contained and given in the facts which stand recorded ; they have, contained in them, the allegorical *import* which is only *exhibited* by the explanation. If ἐστιν ἀλληγ. were to be taken, not in the sense of *being expressed*, but in that of *being conceived* as such, which is certainly found in Plutarch, Synesius, and elsewhere, Paul must have written ἀλληγορεῖται, or the verbal adjective ἀλληγορητέος. Moreover, ἀλληγορεῖν is related to *αἰνίττεσθαι* as *species* to *genus ;* but Hofmann arbitrarily asserts that the *latter* requires for its interpretation *wit*, the former *understanding*. Αἰνίττεσθαι includes *every* obscure or veiled discourse (Herod. v. 56 ; Plat. *Rep.* p. 332 B, and frequently ; Soph. *Aj.* 1137 ; Eur. *Ion.* 430 ; Lucian, *V. H.* i. 2), whether it be in an allegorical form or not, and whether it require wit or not.

[4] In the older Greek, *allegory* was termed ὑπόνοια (see Plut. *de aud. poet.* p. 19 E), Plato, *de Rep.* p. 378 D ; Xen. *Symp.* 3. 6 ; Ruhnk. *ad Tim.* p. 200 f.).

[5] *Synops. Sohar.* p. 25. 1 : "Quicunque dicit narrationes legis alium non habere sensum, quam illius tantum historiae, istius crepet spiritus," "Whoever says that the narratives of the law have no other sense, than only of that history, let his spirit prate." See generally, Döpke, *Hermeneut.* I. p. 104 ff. ; Gfrörer, *Gesch. d. Urchristenth.* I. i. p. 68 ff.

[6] Comp. Tholuck in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, p. 369 ff. ; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 295 f.

[7] We must be on our guard against confounding the idea of the *allegory* with that of the *type* (1 Cor. x. 6, 11 ; Rom. v. 14 ;

---

comp. Heb. ix. 24; 1 Pet. iii. 21), as Calvin and many others have done: "a familia Abrahae *similitudo* ducitur ad ecclesiam; quemadmodum enim Abrahae domus tunc fuit vera ecclesia, ita minime dubium est, quin praecipui et prae aliis memorabiles eventus, qui in ea nobis contigerunt, nobis totidem sint *typi*," "From Abraham's family the comparison is applied to the church; for as the household of Abraham was then the true church, so there is no doubt that the events that are chief and notable above others which have happened to us in it are types to us." Also Tholuck (*d. A. T. im N. T.* p. 39, ed. 6) and Wieseler understand ἀλληγορούμενα as equivalent to τυπικῶς λεγόμενα. But even Philo, *de opif. m.* I. p. 38. 10, puts the type not as equivalent, but only as similar to the allegory; and Josephus, *Antt. prooem.* 4, speaks of Moses as speaking in a partly allegorical sense, without intimating that he intended *historical types*. The allegory and the type are contrasted on the one hand with that which is only πλάσματα μύθων, "figments of myths," and on the other hand with that which is said ἐξ εὐθείας (directly, expressly). But neither does a type necessarily rest on allegorical interpretation, nor does the allegory necessarily presuppose that what is so interpreted is a type; the two may be independent one of the other. Thus, *e.g.*, the allegory of the name of Hagar, in Philo, *Alleg.* II. p. 135. 29, is anything but typology. See the passages themselves in Wetstein. At any rate, the allegory has a much freer scope, and may be handled very differently by different people; "potest alius aliud et argutius fingere et veri cum similitudine suspicari, potest aliud tertius, potest aliud quartus, atque ut se tulerint ingeniorum opinantium qualitates, ita singulae res possunt infinitis interpretationibus explicari," "one can represent more skilfully one thing, and another, another, and regard it as a figure of the truth. A third, another; a fourth, another; and as the qualities of the mind's thinking are disposed, so each subject can be explained with infinite interpretations," Arnobius. The *type* is a real divine preformation of a N. T. fact in the O. T. history. Comp. on Rom. v. 14; also Tholuck, *l.c.* p. 47 ff. But one fact signifies another *allegorically*, when the ideal character of the latter is shown as figuratively presenting itself in the former; in which case the significant fact needs not to be derived from the O. T., and the interpretations may be very various. Comp. Kleinschmidt in the *Mecklenb. theol. Zeitschr.* 1861, p. 859. Matthias, in the interpretation of our passage, abides by the wider idea of "*figure*;" but this does not satisfy the strict idea of the *allegorical*, so far as this is the expression of an inner, *deeper significance*, — of an ἑτέρως νοούμενον.

[1] Baur, *Paulus*, II. p. 312, ed. 2.

[2] Calovius and others.

[3] Comp. Matt. xiii. 20, 38, *et al.*

[4] Usteri.

[5] Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 25.

[6] Bernhardy, p. 223.

[7] Kühner, II. p. 430.

follows in ver. 26, but not in conjunction with *μέν*; see what is said on ver. 26. — *εἰς δουλείαν γεννῶσα*] *bringing forth unto bondage*, that is, placing those who belong to this covenant, by means of their so belonging, *in a state of bondage*, namely, through subjection to the Mosaic law.[1] The notion of a *mother* has caused the retention of the *figurative* expression *γεννῶσα*. — *ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ*] *ἥτις*, *quippe quae*, "which indeed," is neither predicate[2] nor attributive definition,[3] as if it were written *Ἄγαρ οὖσα*, "being Hagar;" but it is the *subject*, just as *ἅτινα* and *αὗται*, and also *ἥτις* in ver. 26. The *name*, not as yet expressed, is now *emphatically* added. The Sinaitic covenant is that which Hagar is in the history referred to—is allegorically identical with Hagar.

Ver. 25. The *ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ*, just said, has now a reason assigned for it, *from the identity of the name "Hagar" with that of Mount Sinai.* *Τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ . . . Ἀραβίᾳ*, however, is not to be *placed in a parenthesis*, because neither in the construction nor in a logical point of view does any interruption occur; but with *συστοιχεῖ δέ* a new sentence is to be commenced. "*This covenant is the Hagar of that allegorical history—a fact which is confirmed by the similarity of the name of this woman with the Arabian designation of Mount Sinai. Not of a different nature, however,*—to indicate now the corresponding relation, according to which no characteristic *dissimilarity* may exist between this woman and the community belonging to the Sinaitic covenant, because otherwise that *ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ* would be destitute of inner truth—*not of a different nature, however, but of a similar nature is Hagar with the present Jerusalem, that is, with the Jewish state; because the latter is, as Hagar once was, in slavery together with those who belong to it.*" This paraphrase at the same time shows what *importance* belongs to the *position* of *συστοιχεῖ* at the *head* of the sentence. — *τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστιν ἐν τ. Ἀραβ.*] That *the name Hagar*[4] accorded with the Arabic name of Sinai, could not but be a fact welcome to the allegorizing Paul in support of his *ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ*.[5]—He now writes *Σινᾶ ὄρος*, and not *ὄρος Σινᾶ* as in ver. 24, because *Ἄγαρ* and *Σινᾶ* are intended to stand in juxtaposition on account of the coincidence of the two *names*. In Arabic حجر means *lapis*, "a stone;" and although no further ancient evidence is preserved that the Arabs called Sinai *κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν*, "pre-eminently," *the stone*,[6] yet Chrysostom in his day says that in their native tongue the name Sinai was thus interpreted; and indeed Büsching[7] quotes the testimony of Harant the traveller,[8] that the Arabs still give the name *Hadschar* to Mount Sinai,—a statement not supported by the evidence of any other travellers. Perhaps it was (and is) merely a *provincial* name current in the vicinity of the mountain, easily explained from the granitic nature of the peaks,[1] with which also the probable signification of the Hebrew סִינַי, the *pointed*,[2] harmonizes,[3] and which became known to the apostle, if not through some other channel previously, by means of his sojourn in Arabia (i. 17).[4] It is true that the name of Hagar (הָגָר) does not properly correspond with the word حجر (חגר), but with هجر *fugit*, "*flees*;" but the allegorizing interpretation of names is too little bound to literal strictness not to find the very *similarity* of the word and the substantial resemblance of sound enough for its purpose, of which we have still stronger and bolder examples in Matt. ii. 23, John ix. 6. Beza, Calvin, Castalio, Estius, Wolf, and others, interpret, "*for Hagar is a type of Mount Sinai in Arabia*;"[5] but against this view the neuter τὸ Ἄγαρ is decisive. [See Note LXVI., p. 215 seq.] — ἐν Ἀραβίᾳ] not *in Arabia situm*, "situated in Arabia"[6]—for how idle would be this topographical remark[7] in the case of a mountain so universally known!—nor equivalent to ἀραβιστί, so that Ἀραβ. would be an adjective and διαλέκτῳ would have to be supplied;[8] but: in *Arabia* the name *Hagar* signifies the Mount *Sinai*.[9] So Chrysostom, Theophylact, Luther ("*for Agar means in Arabia the Mount Sinai*"), Morus, Koppe, Reiche, Reithmayr, and others. — συστοιχεῖ] The *subject* is, as Theodore of Mopsuestia rightly has it, *Hagar*, not *Mount Sinai*[10]—a view which runs entirely counter to the context, according to which the two *women* are the subjects of the allegorical interpretation, while τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ

---

[1] See ver. 1 ff.

[2] Bengel.

[3] *As that διαθήκη, which Hagar* is; so Hofmann.

[4] *τὸ Ἄγαρ* denotes this; see Eph. iv. 9; Kühner, II. p. 137.

[5] Comp. John ix. 6.

[6] We may add that حجر occurs elsewhere as a geographical proper name in *Arabia Petraea*. Thus the Chald. Paraphr. always gives the name חגרא to the wilderness called in the Hebr. שׁוּר As to the *town* حجر, which is, however, to be pronounced *Hidschr* and not *Hadschr*, and, on account of its too remote site, cannot come into consideration here (in opposition to Grotius and others), see Ewald, p. 493 f., and *Jahrb.* VIII. p. 290.

[7] *Erdbeschr.* V. p. 535.

[8] [Who in 1598 was at Sinai, Sieffert.]

---

[1] Robinson, I. p. 170 f.

[2] See Knobel *on Ex.* p. 190.

[3] As to the mineralogical beauty of the mountain, see Fraas, *Aus d. Orient geolog. Beobacht.* 1867.

[4] Comp. also Ewald, p. 495; Reiche, p. 63.

[5] At the same time Calvin and others remark on ἐν Ἀραβίᾳ: "hoc est extra limites terra sanctae, quae symbolum est aeternae haereditatis," "This is outside the limits of the Holy Land, which is the symbol of the eternal inheritance." This reference is also discovered by Wieseler, who, with Lachmann, reads only τὸ γ. Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τ. Ἀραβ., "for the *Sinai* mountain *lies beyond the Holy Land*, and indeed in *Arabia*, where also the alien Hagar is at home." In his view, Paul meant to say that, through their *alien* nature, the Sinaitic διαθήκη and Hagar showed themselves to answer to each other,—namely, as intervenient elements in the history of salvation. But this Paul *has not* said; the substance of it would have to be read *between* the lines. How very natural it would have been for him at least to have written, instead of or in addition to ἐν τ. Ἀραβ., ἔξω (or μακρὰν ἀπό) τῆς γῆς Χαναάν, in order thus at least to give some intimation that the *alien character* was the *point!* This also applies against the view of Hofmann (comp. also his *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 70 f.), who likewise follows the reading, omitting Ἄγαρ, and agrees in substance with Wieseler's explanation, taking Mount Sinai as contrast to Sion, and Arabia as contrast to the land of promise. Comp. also, in opposition to this exposition, which imports elements wholly gratuitous, Ewald, *Jahrb.* X. p. 239.

[6] Schott and older expositors.

[7] Which is not (with Bengel) to be brought into an antithetical relation to συστοιχεῖ δέ (*the Mount Sinai is indeed situated in Arabia, but corresponds*, etc.), as if it were accompanied by a μέν (and with the adoption of Lachmann's reading); for in this case the allegorical signification of the *Hagar* would not be based on any ground.

[8] Matthias.

[9] Observe that the apostle does not at all wish to say that *Hagar* is *in the Arabic language generally* the name of Sinai; but, on the contrary, by ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ he characterizes that name as a *name used in the country, provincial.* Hofmann unjustly finds in the words according to our reading "*absurdity.*"

[10] Vulgate, Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and his followers, Thomas, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Estius, Wolf, Bengel, and others; also Hofmann now.

Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστιν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβ. was merely a collateral remark by way of confirmation. Incorrectly also Studer and Usteri, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius,[1] Windischmann, Reithmayr, hold that the subject is still μία μὲν. ἀπὸ ὄρους Σινᾶ, "one from Mount Sinai," *the Sinaitic constitution.* In this way there would be brought out no *comparison* at all between the subject of συστοιχεῖ and the present Jerusalem ; and yet such, according to the signification of συστοιχεῖν (see afterwards), there must necessarily be, so that in δουλεύει γάρ κ.τ.λ. lies the *tertium comparationis,* "third object of comparison." The Sinaitic διαθήκη is not of a *similar nature* with the present Jerusalem, but is itself the constitution of it ; on that very account, however, according to the allegorical comparison *Hagar* corresponds to the present Jerusalem. συστοιχεῖν means *to stand in the same row;*[2] that is, here, to stand in the same *category,*[3] to be of the same *nature and species,* σύστοιχον εἶναι.[4] Consequently : *Hagar belongs to the same category with the present Jerusalem,* is of a like nature with it,[5] has in common with it the same characteristic relation, in so far namely that, as Hagar was a bondwoman, the present Jerusalem with its children is also in bondage.[6] Thus συστ. expresses the *correspondence.* But it is incorrect to take it as : *she confronts as parallel.*[7] This must have been expressed by ἀντιστοιχεῖ.[8] Many of those who regard Sinai as the subject (see above) interpret : "*it extends as far as Jerusalem.*"[9] This would have to be more exactly defined with Genebrardus, *ad Ps.* cxxxiii. 3, following out the literal meaning of the word συστοιχεῖ : "*perpetuo dorso sese versus Sionis montes exporrigit,*" "it extends in an unbroken ridge to the mountains of Zion." But even granting the geographical reality of the description, and setting aside the fact that Sinai is not the subject, Paul must have named, instead of τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσ., *Mount Zion.* Hofmann, in reference to the position of Sinai in Arabia and of Jerusalem in the land of promise, interprets the expression *locally* indeed, but as indicative of the *non-local* relation, that the present Jerusalem belongs to the same category with the mountain although Arabian, which has it side by side *on the same line in the order of the history of salvation.* An artificial consequence of the geographical contrast introduced as regards ἐν Ἀραβ., as well as of the erroneous assumption that Mount Sinai is the subject. At the same time a turn is given to the interpretation, as if Paul had written συστοιχεῖ δὲ αὐτῷ ἡ νῦν Ἱερουσ. — τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλήμ] does not stand in contrast to the *former Salem,*[10] but in Paul's view means the present Jerusalem

---

[1] Also Hofmann formerly.

[2] See Polyb. x. 21. 7, and Wetstein.

[3] συστοιχία, Aristot. *Metaph.* i. 5, pp. 986, 1004.

[4] Theophr. *c. pl.* vi. 4. 2 ; Arist. *Meteor.* i. 3 ; Lucian, *q. hist. conscr.* 43.

[5] Comp. Polyb. xiii. 8. 1 : ὅμοια καὶ σύστοιχα.

[6] See below.

[7] Rückert, Winer. Comp. also Wieseler : "corresponds to it ; not, however, at a *like,* but at a *different* stage," whereby the idea of a *type* is expressed. This view is not to be supported by Polyb. x. 21. 7, where συζυγοῦντας καὶ συστοιχοῦντας διαμένειν means to *remain in rank and file* ("servare ordines secundum παραστάτας et ἐπιβάτας," Schweighäuser), so that as well the συζυγοῦντες as the συστοιχοῦντες always form *one* row with one another.

[8] Xen. *Symp.* 2. 20, *Anab.* v. 4. 12 ; comp. ἀντίστοιχος, Eur. *Andr.* 746, and ἀντιστοιχία, Plut. *Mor.* p. 474 A.

[9] Vulgate, Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Wolf, and others.

[10] Erasmus, Michaelis.

belonging to the pre-Messianic period, as opposed to ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσ. (ver. 26), which after the παρουσία will take its place. See on ver. 26. Moreover, the present Jerusalem and its children[1] represent *the Israelitic commonwealth and its members.*[2] — δουλεύει γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] namely, to the Mosaic law. The bondage *to Rome*[3] is not, according to the context, referred to either alone[4] or *jointly.*[5] The subject is ἡ νῦν Ἱερουσ., and not Ἄγαρ.[6] Looking at the usage both of classical authors and the N. T., there is nothing surprising in the *change* of subject.[7] Lachmann (also Ewald) has incorrectly placed the words δουλεύει . . . αὐτῆς in a parenthesis.

Note.—If the reading of Bengel and Lachmann, τὸ γ. Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τ. Ἀραβ., be adopted, the interpretation would simply be: "*for the Sinai Mount is in Arabia;*" so that ἐν τῇ Ἀραβ. would serve to support the allegorical relation of Hagar to Sinai, seeing that Hagar also was *in Arabia* and the ancestress of the Arabians. This certainly forms a ground of support much too vague, and not befitting the dialectic acuteness of the apostle. In the case of the *Recepta* also, ἐν τῇ Ἀραβ., taken as a *geographical* notice, is so superfluous and aimless, that Schott's uncritical conjecture, treating the words τὸ γ. Ἄγ. ὄρ. Σ. ἐ. ἐν τ. Ἀραβ. as a double gloss, is not surprising. Bentley, who is followed by Mill, *Proleg.* § 1306, even wished to retain nothing of the passage but τὸ δὲ Ἄγαρ συστοιχεῖ τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσ. κ.τ.λ. Against the interpretation of ἐν τῇ Ἀραβ. by Wieseler and Hofmann, see above.

Ver. 26. But altogether different from the position of the present Jerusalem is that of the *upper Jerusalem*, which is *free;* and *this upper Jerusalem* is our mother. — δέ] places the ἄνω Ἱερουσ. in contrast with the previous τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσ. The μία μέν of ver. 24 has been left, in consequence of the digression occasioned by the remarks made in ver. 25, without any correlative to follow it (such as ἡ δὲ ἑτέρα),—an omission which is quite in harmony with the rapid movement of Pauline thought.[8] He leaves it to the reader to form for himself the second part of the allegorical interpretation after the similarity of the first, and only adduces so much of it as is directly suggested by the contrast of the just characterized τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσ. He leaves it, therefore, to the reader to supply the following thought: "But the other covenant, which is allegorically represented in this history, is the covenant instituted by Christ, which brings forth to freedom: this is Sarah, who is of the same nature with the upper Jerusalem; for the latter is, as Sarah was, free with its children, and to this upper Jerusalem we Christians as children belong." — ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ] is neither the *ancient* Jerusalem, the Salem of Melchizedek,[9] nor *Mount Zion*, which is called in Josephus ἡ ἄνω πόλις,[10] as among the Greeks the Acropolis at Athens was also so named.[11] Both interpretations are opposed to the context, and the former to linguistic usage.[1] The contrast between heaven and earth elsewhere conveyed by ἄνω, as used by Paul (Phil. iii. 14 ; Col. iii. 2), is found here also, since ἡ νῦν Ἱερ. is the *earthly* Jerusalem. It is true that this contrast would have been more accurately expressed if, instead of τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσ., he had written τῇ κάτω Ἱερουσ. (ירושלים של מטה), "the Jerusalem below ;" but in using the νῦν he thought of the *future* Jerusalem as its contrast (Heb. xiii. 14), and afterwards *changed* his mode of representation, by conceiving the future as the *upper:* for it is the *heavenly* Jerusalem, called by the Rabbins ירושלים של מעלה, "Jerusalem on high," which, according to Jewish teaching, is the archetype in heaven of the earthly Jerusalem, and on the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom is let down to earth, in order to be the centre and capital of the Messianic theocracy, just as the earthly Jerusalem was the centre and capital of the ancient theocracy. Comp. Heb. xi. 10, xii. 22, xiii. 14 ; Rev. iii. 12, xxi. 2.[2] And as previously the present Jerusalem represented the Jewish divine commonwealth, so here the upper Jerusalem represents the *Messianic theocracy*, which before the παρουσία, "presence or coming of Christ," is the *church*, and after the παρουσία is the glorious *kingdom of the Messiah.* With justice, accordingly, the church on earth (not merely the "ecclesia *triumphans*," "church triumphant"), has at all times been deemed included in the heavenly Jerusalem,[3] for the latter is, in relation to the church, its πολίτευμα [*commonwealth*, according to others : citizenship], which is in heaven (Phil. iii. 20). The heavenly completion of the church in Christ ensues at the παρουσία, in which Christ who rules in heaven will manifest in glory the life—hitherto hidden with Him in God[4]—of the community, which is the body and πλήρωμα, "fulness," of Him its Head (Eph. i. 22 f.). Thus the church on earth is already the theocracy of the heavenly Jerusalem, and has its πολίτευμα in heaven ; but this its κληρονομία, "inheritance," is, until the παρουσία, only an ideal and veiled, although in hope *assured*, possession, which at the second coming of the Lord at length attains objective and glorious realization. It is, however, by no means to be asserted that Paul entertained the sensuous Rabbinical conceptions of the heavenly Jerusalem ;[5] for he nowhere presents, or even so much as hints, at them, often as he speaks of the παρουσία and the consequences connected with it. In his view, the heavenly Jerusalem was the national setting for the idea—founded on the exalted Christ as its central point—of *the kingdom of the Messiah before and after its glorious realization.* — ἐλευθέρα ἐστιν] that is, independent of the Mosaic law (opposite of the δουλεύει in ver. 25), in free, moral self-determination, under the higher life-principle of the Spirit (Rom.

---

[1] "*Inhabitants;*" see Matt. xxiii. 37, Ps. cxlix. 2.

[2] Comp. Isa. xl. 2.

[3] Pelagius.

[4] Castalio, Ewald.

[5] Bengel.

[6] Cornelius à Lapide, Grotius, and others.

[7] Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Gorg.* p. 510 C; Winer, p. 586.

[8] Comp. Rom. vii. 12, *et al.;* also Rom. v. 12.

[9] Oeder, Michaelis, Paulus.

[10] See the passages in Ottii *Spicil. ex Josepho*, p. 400 f.

[11] Vitringa, Elsner, Mill, Wolf, Rambach, Moldenhauer, Zachariae.

---

[1] ἄνω always means *above.* When it appears to mean *olim*, it denotes the ascending line of ancestry, as *e.g.* in Plat. *Legg.* ix. p. 880 B : ἢ πατρὶ ἢ ἔτι ἀνωτέρω, "either to the father or one still higher." *Theaet.* p. 175 B *al.;* the earlier time lying behind being regarded as higher (Polyb. v. 6. 1, iv. 2. 3, iv. 50. 3).

[2] See generally Schoettgen, *de Hieros. coelest.* in his *Horae*, p. 1205 ff. ; Meuschen, *N. T. ex Talm. ill.* p. 199 ff. ; Wetstein, *in loc.;* Bertholdt, *Christol.* p. 211 ff. ; Ewald, *ad Apoc.* p. 11, 307.

[3] See Luther, and especially Calovius, *in loc.*

[4] See on Col. iii. 3 f.

[5] See Eisenmenger, *entdeckt. Judenth.* II. p. 839 ff.

viii. 2 ; 2 Cor. iii. 17). —*ἥτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν*] correlative with the above-mentioned *μετὰ τῶν τέκν. αὐτῆς* ; hence, if Paul had wished to lay the stress upon *ἡμῶν*,[1] he must have made this evident by the marked position *ἥτις ἡμῶν μήτ. ἐ.* The emphasis lies rather on *ἥτις*, that is, *she who*, etc. (comp. on ver. 24), *quippe quae* libera Hierosol, "since she is the free Jerusalem." *To this* Jerusalem as our *πολίτευμα*, "commonwealth," we Christians belong, as children to their mother (Phil. iii. 20 ; Eph. ii. 19). *In bondage*, it would not be our mother. Hofmann interprets differently : "the freedom of this Jerusalem *may be seen in her children.*" But this would be a correlative *retrospective conclusion*, since Paul has neither written *ὅτι* (but *ἥτις*), nor has he expressed himself participially *οὖσα μήτ. ἡμ.* *μήτηρ* without the article is *qualitative.* That *ἡμῶν* applies to the Christians *generally*, including also the Gentile Christians, is obvious of itself from the context, and does not require the addition of *πάντων* in the *Textus receptus*, which is defended by Ewald (in opposition to Reiche), to make it evident.

Ver. 27. Proof from Scripture[2] that no other than *this*, the *free Jerusalem* (*ἥτις*), is our mother. This, namely, is according to Paul the subject addressed, the *unfruitful* one, because Sarah—who, according to the allegory, answers to the heavenly Jerusalem—was, as is well known, barren. The *historical* sense of the prophecy (Isa. liv. 1, exactly according to the LXX.) is the joyful promise of a great increase to the depressed people of God in *its state of freedom* after the Babylonian exile. The desolate, uninhabited Jerusalem, which had become like an unfruitful wife, is summoned to rejoice, because it—and in this light, certainly, it is poetically compared with itself as a second person (in opposition to Hofmann)—is to become more populous, more rich in children, than formerly, when it was the husband-possessing spouse (of Jehovah). The *fulfilment* of this Messianic prophecy—*Messianic* because pervaded by the idea of the victorious theocracy—is discerned by Paul in the great new people of God, which belongs to the *ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ*, to this Sarah in the sense of the fulfilment, as its mother. Before the emergence of the Christian people of God, this heavenly Jerusalem was still unpeopled, childless ; it was *στεῖρα*, "barren," *οὐ τίκτουσα*, "not bringing forth," *οὐκ ὠδίνουσα*, "not in travail," *ἔρημος*, "desolate" (*solitaria*, that is, in conformity with the contrast : without *conjugal* intercourse), consequently quite the Sarah of the allegory, before she became the mother of Isaac. But in and with the emergence of the Christian people of God, the *ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ* has become a fruitful mother, rejoicing over her wealth of children, richer in children than *ἡ νῦν Ἱερουσαλήμ*, this mother of the ancient people of God, which hitherto, like Hagar, had been בְּעוּלָה, *ἡ ἔχουσα τὸν ἄνδρα*, "married." This *ἀνήρ*, "husband," is God (not the law, as Luther interprets), whose relation to the theocratical commonwealth of the old covenant is conceived as conjugal intercourse. In virtue of this idea, the relation of God to the *νῦν Ἱερουσαλήμ*—the latter regarded as a woman ἡ ἔχουσα τὸν ἄνδρα—is the counterpart of the relation of Abraham to the παιδίσκη, "bondwoman," Hagar, whose descendants came into life κατὰ σάρκα, "according to the flesh." On the other hand, the relation of God to the ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ—the latter likewise regarded as a woman, who, however, had hitherto been στεῖρα κ.τ.λ.—is the counterpart of the relation of Abraham to the free Sarah, whose far more numerous descendants were children of promise (ver. 28). Comp. Rom. ix. 8. — ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα] not for the *past participle*,[1] but expressing the *state of the case as it stands*: "*which does not bear*," the consequence of στεῖρα, *sterilis*, unfruitful, as Sarah was עֲקָרָה, "barren." In the same way afterwards, ἡ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα. — ῥῆξον] φωνήν is usually supplied. For *many* instances of ῥήγνυμι φωνήν or αὐδήν,[2] to unchain the voice, that is, to *speak aloud*, see Wetstein, *in loc.*; Loesner, *Obss.* p. 333; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* X. p. 385, XI. p. 57, XII. p. 131.[3] But since the verb *alone* is never thus used, it is safer to derive the supplement from what has preceded; hence Kypke and Schott correctly supply εὐφροσύνην, "gladness" (*rumpe jubilum, begin to rejoice*), not because פִּצְחִי רִנָּה, "break forth into joy," stands in the Hebrew (Schott), but because εὐφροσύνην flows from the previous εὐφράνθητι;[4] "rejoice, *let it break forth.*" The opposite is ῥήγνυμι κλαυθμόν, "break into weeping" (Plut. *Per.* 36), ῥήγν. δακρύων νάματα, "break into streams of tears" (Soph. *Trach.* 919). — στεῖρα κ.τ.λ. applies in the connection of the original text to Jerusalem, and is also here necessarily (see ver. 26)—according to the Messianic fulfilment of the prophecy, in the light of which Paul apprehends the scriptural saying—to be referred to Jerusalem, but to the ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἥτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν, whereas the ἡ ἔχουσα τὸν ἄνδρα which is placed in comparison with it is the νῦν Ἱερουσαλήμ. See above. Chrysostom and his successors, Bengel and others, consider that the words στεῖρα κ.τ.λ. apply to the *Gentile Christians* (she who had the husband being the *Jewish* church); but against this view it may be urged that that ἥτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν, which refers to *all* Christians, is to be proved by ver. 27. — πολλὰ . . . μᾶλλον ἤ] not used instead of πλείονα ἤ, "more than," which would leave the *multitude* of children entirely undetermined; but it affirms that *both had many children*,—the *solitary one*, however, the *greater* number: for numerous are the children of the *solitary one in a higher degree than* those of her who possessed the husband. So the LXX. has rightly understood the Hebrew רַבִּים מִבְּנֵי.

---

[1] Winer, Matthias.

[2] For this Scriptural proof, the particular passage Isa. liv. 1 is selected with great skill and true tact, since the ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ, "Jerusalem above," is the allegorical counterpart of *Sarah*, this στεῖρα ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα κ.τ.λ, "barren, not bringing forth," etc.

Ver. 28. It is not till ver. 29 that a *new* thought is entered on; hence ver. 28 is to be regarded as a remark explaining the *fulfilment* of the prophetic utterence, which has its actual realization in *the case of Christians*, and is to be annexed to ver. 27 (by a semicolon). So correctly, in opposition to the usual separation from ver. 27.[5] — But the *Christians* (ὑμεῖς individualizing; see the critical notes) *are the many children of that spiritual Sarah, the heavenly Jerusalem!* — κατὰ Ἰσαάκ] *After the manner of Isaac;* comp. 1 Pet. i. 15; and see Wetstein and Kypke, also Heindorf.[6] — ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα] ἐπαγγ. is emphatically prefixed : children of Abraham, who are not so by carnal descent like Ishmael, but *by promise.* So, namely, as Isaac was born to Abraham *in virtue of the promise* (ver. 23), are Christians by means of divine promise also children of Abraham, in virtue of the fact that they were promised by God to Abraham as τέκνα, "children ;" without which promise, having reference to them, they would not stand in the relation of sonship to Abraham. Comp. Rom. ix. 8. We must not on account of ver. 23 explain the expression here, any more than in Rom. ix. 8,[1] as *liberi promissi*, "the children promised."[2]

---

[1] Grotius and others.

[2] Eur. *Suppl.* 710.

[3] Comp. the Latin *rumpere vocem* (Drakenborch, *ad Sil. It.* iv. 528).

[4] The LXX. probably did not read רנה, "joy."

[5] Hofmann, Ewald, Wieseler.

[6] *Ad Plat. Gorg.* p. 225 f.

Vv. 29, 30. Nevertheless, notwithstanding this their higher state of sonship, these *spiritual* children of Abraham are persecuted by the bodily children of Abraham, as was formerly the case with Isaac and Ishmael ; but (ver. 30) how wholly without ultimate success is, and, according to the Scripture, must be, this persecution ! This is not a collateral trait (Holsten), but the consolatory practical result in which the allegory terminates —its *triumphantly joyful conclusion.* Comp. on ver. 31. — τότε] *then*, namely, at that time when the allegorically-significant history came to pass. — ὁ κατὰ σάρκα γεννηθείς] see ver. 23. — ἐδίωκε] *persecuted.* It is true that in Gen. xxi. 9, Ishmael is designated only as a *mocker* (of Isaac).[3] But Paul follows the *tradition*, which, starting from the basis of that statement, went further.[4] According to Hofmann, Paul in the word διώκειν probably intends a *running after* Isaac wantonly to *annoy* him (just as the partisans of the law *followed after the believing Gentiles* in order to annoy them, vv. 10, 12). Quite unsupported by any historical evidence, and very inappropriate to the ταράσσειν of the Judaists (of which there is no mention here at all) ; comp. i. 7. — τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα] *him that is born according to the Spirit*, that is, him who was born in consequence of the intervening agency of the Holy Spirit (for the divine πνεῦμα, as the principle of the divine promise, is instrumental in the efficacy of the latter). By means of the *vis carnis* Isaac could not have been born, but only by means of the *vis Spiritus divini*, which, operative in the divine promise, furnished at his procreation (Rom. iv. 17 ff.) the capacity of generation and conception. In fact, therefore, τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα conveys the same idea as τὸν διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας γεννηθέντα, ver. 23. The explanation : *per singularem efficacitatem Dei*, "by the unique efficaciousness of God,"[5] compares things which are in their nature different (Luke i. 35), and is not verbally accurate. And Hilgenfeld unnecessarily assumes[6] that the expression is to be explained by a blending together of the ideal reference of the allegory to the Christians, and of its historical basis. — *οὕτω καὶ νῦν*] So also now the children of Abraham according to the flesh (the Jews) persecute those who are Abraham's children *κατὰ πνεῦμα* (Christians, *ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα*, ver. 28). Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 15. This *οὕτω καὶ νῦν* does not exclude any kind of persecution which the Christians suffered at the hands of the Jews; but that which is intended must have been actual *persecutions*, such as those to which the Christians as a body were so generally at that time subjected by the Jews, and not the *ταράσσειν* on the part of the Judaists.[1] — *ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή;*] triumphantly introduces the divine certainty of the want of success, which will attend this *διώκειν*, to the destruction of the persecutors themselves. Observe how the importance of the utterance is brought out more vividly by the *interrogative* announcement.[2] The quotation is from Gen. xxi. 10, almost exactly following the LXX. Instead of *μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ μου Ἰσαάκ*, "with my son Isaac," in the LXX.,[3] Paul has written *μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρας*, not accidentally, but in order to give prominence to the contrast, which significantly refers back to the chief point of the allegory (comp. ver. 22). — *ἔκβαλε κ.τ.λ.*] The words of Sarah to Abraham (which, however, in Gen. xxi. 12 are expressly approved by God and confirmed with a view to fulfilment), requiring the expulsion of Hagar and her son *from the house*. From this, looking to the scope of the allegory, the Galatians are to infer the exclusion of the non-free Jews, who were now persecuting the free Christians, from the people of God. This exclusion already actually exists even in the present *αἰών*, in so far as the true Israel which is free from the law (the *Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, vi. 16) has taken the place of the ancient people of God, and will attain its perfect realization at the *παρουσία*, "coming of Christ," when none but the free Christian family of God will share in the *κληρονομία*, "inheritance," of eternal Messianic salvation. Comp. iii. 18, 29. According to Hofmann,[4] the meaning is, that as Abraham *separated* Ishmael from Isaac, so also the readers are to *dismiss from among them*, as unentitled to share in their inheritance, those who desired to force upon them their own legalism; the Christian body ought to remain *undisturbed* by such persons. This weakening of the idea is impossible with a correct conception of *διώκειν* in ver. 29; the *sure divine Nemesis* against the persecutors must be meant—the divine *ἐκδίκησις*, "vengeance" (Luke xviii. 7 f.; 2 comp. Thess. i. 6, 8). — *οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρον*] prefixed with great emphasis; the son of the bondwoman *shall assuredly not inherit*.[5] As to the exclusion, according to the Israelite law, of the children of a concubine from the right of inheritance, see Selden, *de success. ad leg. Hebr.* p. 28; Saalschütz, *M. R.* p. 831; Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 266. [See Note LXVII., p. 216.]

---

[1] See *in loc.*

[2] Winer and others.

[3] The idea that Paul, in using ἐδίωκε, really intended nothing more than this *mocking* ("nulla enim persecutio tam molesta esse nobis debet, quam dum impiorum ludibriis videmus labefactari nostram vocationem," "For no persecution should be so grievous to us as that which occurs when we see our calling shaken by the reproaches of the godless," Calvin), is not in harmony with the comprehensive sense of the word.

[4] See Beresch. R. liii. 15: Dixit Ismael Isaaco : eamus et videamus portionem nostram in agro ; et tulit Ismael arcum et sagittas, et jaculatus est Isaacum et prae se tulit ac si luderet," "Ishmael said to Isaac : Let us go and see our portion in the field ; and Ishmael carried the bow and arrows, and shot at Isaac, and acted as though he were in sport."

[5] Schott.

[6] Comp. Bengel.

Ver. 31 is usually looked upon as the keystone, as the final result of *the previous discourse*. "Applicat historiam et allegoriam, et summam absolvit brevi conclusione," "He applies the history and allegory, and brings it to a close in a brief conclusion," Luther, 1519. But so taken, the purport of ver.

---

[1] Hofmann; see on *ἐδίωκε*.

[2] Comp. Rom. iv. 3, x. 8, xi. 2, 4; Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 186, 347; Blomfield, *Gloss. ad Aesch. Pers.* 1013.

[3] Which therefore D* E? F G, codd. of the Itala, and some Fathers read also here.

[4] Comp. also his *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 71.

[5] Comp. Gen. xxv. 5 f.

31 appears to express far too little, and to be feeble, because it has been already more than once implied in what precedes (see vv. 26, 28). We do not get rid of this incongruity, even if with Rückert we prefer the reading *ἡμεῖς δέ*, also approved by Hofmann (see the crit. notes), and assume the tacit inference : "consequently the inheritance cannot escape us, expulsion does not affect us." For, after the whole argument previously developed, any such express application of ver. 30 to Christians would have been entirely superfluous ; no reader needed it, in order clearly to discern and deeply to feel the certainty of victory conveyed in ver. 30 ; hence ver. 31 would be halting and without force. No ; *ver.* 31 *begins a new section.*[1] The allegorical instruction, which from ver. 22 onwards Paul has given, comes to a close forcibly and appropriately with the triumphant language of Scripture in ver. 30 ; and now Paul will follow it up by the exhortation to stand fast in their Christian liberty (v. 1). But first of all, as a basis for this exhortation, he prefixes to it the proposition—resulting from the previous instruction—which forms the "pith of the allegory,"[2] and exactly as such is fitted to be the theoretical principle placed at the head of the practical course of action to be required in the sequel, ver. 31. This proposition is then followed by *τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν*, v. 1, which very forcibly serves as a medium of transition to the direct summons *στήκετε οὖν*. "*Therefore, brethren*,—seeing that our position is such as results from this allegory,—*we are not children of a bond-woman* (like the Jews), *but of the free woman ; for freedom Christ has made us free : stand therefore fast*," etc.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

LIII. Ver. 1. *νήπιος*.

Νήπιος is the etymological equivalent of the Latin *infans* (N-*ἔπος*—*in fans*, in both cases negativing the idea of speech. Hence the word has here the force of the technical legal "*infant*," viz., a minor. Liddell and Scott find the meaning of "one still unfit to bear arms" in Hom. *Il.* ii. 136 ; ix. 440.

LIV. Ver. 4. *γενόμενον ὑπο νόμον*.

The application of this passage, rejected by Meyer, is thus stated by Philippi : "From the strict, even emphatic correspondence in the expression of thesis and antithesis, it manifestly follows that the Son of God was under the law in the same way as was Israel, in order to redeem Israel from slavery to the law, and to introduce it into the adoption of God's children. But in its youth, like a minor to pedagogues, Israel was subject to the ordinances of the law demanding fulfilment, corresponding to which the redeeming work of the Son of God is to be regarded as a vicarious fulfilment of the law, and in this connection his atoning death appears of itself as the completion of his obedience rendered to the demands of the law (his *γενέσθαι ὑπὸ νόμον*). The passages cited, viz.

---

[1] Comp. Lachmann, de Wette, Ewald, Hofmann.

[2] Holsten.

Matt. xx. 28 ; John iv. 34 ; Phil. ii. 8 ; Gal. iv. 4 ; cf. Heb. v. 7, 8, treat the Lord's death as the culmination of His entire obedience of life, and represent the life, passion and death of the Redeemer under a point of view entirely indivisible, which is none other than that of the vicarious fulfilment of the law. The vicarious obedience of life, in distinction from the vicarious surrender of life, in which it ceases, is typically prefigured in the O. T. For the priest was the substitute of the people accepted of God, not only by his presentation of the offering, but already in the Levitical purity and spotlessness of his nature, life and conversation." *Kirchliche Glaubenslehre*, iv. 2 : 296 sq.

LV. Ver. 6. *τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ.*

Meyer does not express all that is contained in the words "the Spirit of His Son." "If in John xiv. 16 only the procession of the Spirit from the Father is treated of, yet He proceeds not only from the Father through the Son, but also from the Son Himself. 'For he shall receive of mine,' says the Lord, John xvi. 14 ; and as the Father gives and sends Him, so also does the Son. Cf. Matt. iii. 11 ; John i. 33 ; Acts ii. 33, possibly also John vii. 38, 39. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." With these words He Himself imparts the spirit to His disciples. In Rom. viii. 9 the Spirit of God is also called the Spirit of Christ ; in Phil. i. 19, the Spirit of Jesus Christ ; in 2 Cor. iii. 17, the Spirit of the Lord ; in Gal. iv. 6, the Spirit of His Son ; and in Rev. xxii. 1, a stream of living water (cf. John vii. 38, 39 ; also iv. 14) proceeds from the throne of God and of the Lamb. The Spirit is accordingly just as much the possession of the Son as of the Father." (Philippi's *Kirchliche Glaubenslehre*, ii. 222.)

LVI. Ver. 8. *τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσι θεοῖς.*

Sieffert cannot appreciate any change of meaning, resulting from the transfer of the *μὴ* from before the *φύσει*, as in the text. recept. to before *οὖσι*, as in best codices. In either case a pure negative is expressed that the false gods are not gods in reality, and there is nothing implied on either side of the question as to whether they are pure fiction or have an objective existence as demonia. This must be determined from other passages, 1 Cor. viii. 4, x. 19, 20.

LVII. Ver. 9. *γνόντες.*

While Meyer's disproof of Olshausen's distinction is conclusive, that of Lightfoot must be accepted : "While *οἶδα*, I know, refers to the knowledge of facts absolutely, *γινώσκω*, I recognize, being relative, gives prominence either to the *attainment* or the *manifestation* of the knowledge." So Westcott on 1 John ii. 29 : "Knowledge which is absolute (*εἰδῆτε*) becomes the basis of knowledge that is realized in observation (*γινώσκετε*)." The same distinction is observed in classical Greek. Liddell and Scott's Lexicon (under *γιγνώσκω*) : "The strict distinction seems to be that the former class, *ἐγνωκέναι*, *novisse*, etc., means to know by observation, the latter *εἰδέναι*, *scire*, etc., to know by reflection. Thucydides i. 69 : *ἐγὼ δ' οἶδ' ὅτι γιγνώσκετε τοῦτον ἅπαντες*," "I know that ye all have come to know this one." The same distinction underlies the German *Kennen* and *Wissen*. It is recognized in the Revised Version by the rendering : "*But now that ye have come to know God, or rather to be known of God.*"

LVIII. Ver. 9. γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ.

Sieffert's exceptions to Meyer's argument seem invalid ; but a more careful observance of the distinction between the two words "to know," used in verses 8 and 9, makes the argument clearer, as exhibited in a compressed form by Sanday : "In speaking of the Galatians as 'coming to know' God, it might seem as if too much stress was laid on the human side of the process, and therefore, by way of correction, the apostle presents also the divine side. Any true and saving knowledge of God has for its converse the 'being known of God,' *i.e.*, recognition by God and acceptance by Him, such as is involved in the admission of the believer into the Messianic kingdom."

LIX. Ver. 12. γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ.

Such an appeal, however, implies no yielding of the principle involved. The argument is well paraphrased by Lightfoot : "I gave up all those time-honored customs, all those dear associations of race to become like you. I have lived as a Gentile to please you Gentiles. Will you then abandon me, when I have abandoned all for you?"

LX. Ver. 14. οἴδατε δὲ ὅτι κ.τ.λ.

In reply, Sieffert defends Lachmann and Buttmann by maintaining that there is no flaw in the discourse here, which assumes an abrupt character as frequently, because of the deep emotion of the apostle ; that in vv. 10–12 there is a succession of disjointed sentences, and that in chap. ii. 21 asyndeton in beginning of sentence occurs. He proposes this paraphrase : "Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached, etc., and how ye were put to the test in my flesh."

LXI. Ver. 14. εξεπτύσατε.

Marginal reading of Revised Version : "*spat out.*" Lightfoot : "Ye did not treat with contemptuous indifference or active loathing."

LXII. Ver. 15. τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν.

Eadie (pp. 329–341) has an excursus on Paul's infirmity. The various views are classified : I. The carnal style of his preaching (Jerome). II. Persecution (Chrysostom, Eusebius of Emessa, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Ambrosiast ; also Calvin, Beza, Fritzsche, Schrader, Hammond, Reiche). III. Inner temptation. 1. To unbelief, stirring up of remaining sin, pangs of sorrow on account of his past life (Gerson, Luther, Calvin, Osiander, Calovius). 2. To incontinence (Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great, Salvian, Thomas Aquinas, Bede, Lyra, Bellarmine, Estius, à Lapide, Bisping) ; against which (*a*) such would not be given by God. (*b*) Nor could he have gloried in this, 2 Cor. xii. 9. (*c*) Nor would this inner struggle have exposed him to scorn or aversion. (*d*) He declares his perfect freedom from such temptations, 1 Cor. vii. 7. Luther : "Ah no, dear Paul ; it was no such trial as afflicted thee." IV. Some painful and acute corporeal malady, which could not be concealed, but had a tendency to induce loathing (Flatt, Billroth, Emmerling, Rückert, Meyer, de Wette, Lightfoot, Alford, Howson, Chandler, Böttger, Eadie). Against the view that it was a malady of the eyes, among other arguments, it is urged : (*a*) The translation, ver. 15, "*your eyes*," is unemphatic, not "your own eyes." (*b*) Defect of vision would not induce the loathing of ver. 14. (*c*) The thorn was given fourteen years before he wrote 2 Cor. ; but his conversion was much earlier. (*d*) Arguments to prove that he was permanently blinded are untrustworthy. Other conjectures concerning specific affection : hypochondriacal melancholy, haemorrhoids, kidney-disease, gout, the stone, severe headache, epilepsy. Each must be tested by the loathing mentioned in this epistle.

LXIII. ver. 17. *ἵνα αὐτοὺς δηλοῦτε.*

Such adverbial force of *ἵνα* as that proposed by Meyer is without an instance in either the LXX. or N. T. The same use of *ἵνα* with indicative occurs also in 1 Cor. iv. 6. Unjustified by classical Greek, Winer declares that "in later works it occurs so frequently as to preclude the supposition that every instance is a mistake of transcribers." The process of Meyer's interpretation from that of the fourth to the fifth edition shows how unnatural the application. Besides, the telic and the adverbial *ἵνα* are in reality the same word, and the attention must be confined here altogether to the difference of moods. Winer's remark, that in both passages the verb after *ἵνα* is one ending in *οω*, is worthy of note. Hence Buttmann's hypothesis that the present of this class of verbs has with *ἵνα* the force of the future. Sieffert, in common with almost all interpreters, takes issue with Meyer.

LXIV. ver. 21. *τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε.*

There seems no reason to depart from the simpler and ordinarily received meaning : "Will ye not listen to the law?" Argued in Ellicott, with whom agree Alford, Schmoller, Eadie, Lightfoot and Sanday.

LXV. ver. 24. *ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα.*

Sieffert adds, instead of what follows in Meyer : "But whether he ascribed the latter to all the details of his exposition is, nevertheless, a question. In any event Meyer's assertion is incorrect that Paul has raised this allegory to the keystone of his whole antinomistic reasoning, etc. On the contrary, Schott's judgment is perfectly apposite. For the proper doctrinal demonstration is concluded already in chap. iv. 7, while the allegory is introduced into the midst of the personal admonition to Christian freedom beginning already in ch. iv. 8. (iv. 8–20, v. 1–12), and is expressly designated (v. 21) as intended for the special practical wants of the readers . . . Meyer's assertion, that the argument falls wholly to the ground as a real proof in the view of a faith not associated with Rabbinical training, pertains of course to the allegorical form of the proof."

LXVI. ver. 25. *τὸ Ἄγαρ.*

"If the word Hagar be omitted [according to ℵ C F G 17, the old Latin, Vulgate, Aethiopic, and Armenian versions ; Origen, Epiphanius, Cyril, Damascenus, Victorinus, the Ambrosian Hilary, Augustine, Jerome, Pelagius, Primarius, and probably *all* the Latin Fathers"], the passage is capable of a very easy and natural interpretation : 'Sinai,' St. Paul argues, 'is situated in Arabia, the country of Hagar's descendants, the land of bond-slaves.' And such, too, seems to be the most probable account of his meaning, even though with the received text we retain Hagar : 'This Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia,' *i.e.*, it represents Mount Sinai, because Mount Sinai is in Arabia, the land of Hagar and her descendants. It is not ἡ Ἄγαρ, the woman Hagar, but τὸ Ἄγαρ, the thing Hagar, the Hagar of the allegory, the Hagar which is under discussion." See the very learned and minute examination of this passage in the special excursus, pp. 192–200 of Bp. Lightfoot's commentary, from which the above is taken. In it will be found Philo's allegory of Hagar and Sarah.

LXVII. ver. 29.

The opinion of Sieffert is worthy of note, that the main object of the apostle is to show how the parallel subsisting between Hagar and Sarah is also applicable to their sons, Ishmael and Isaac, to whom also the allegory is pertinent.

CHAPTER V.

VER. 1. *τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ, ᾗ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσε, στήκετε*] So Griesb. (reading, however, *Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς*), Rück., Tisch. (1859), Wieseler. But Elz., Matth., Winer, Rinck, Reiche, read *τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ οὖν, ᾗ Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἠλευθέρωσε, στήκετε.* Lachm., followed by Usteri, reads *τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν. στήκετε οὖν*, which was also approved of by Mill, Bengel, Griesb. [Eadie, Tisch. (1872)]; and Winer does not reject it. Scholz gives *τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ, ᾗ Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἠλευθέρωσε, στήκετε οὖν.* Schott lastly, following Rinck, joins *τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ, ᾗ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν* to iv. 31, and begins the new sentence with *στήκετε οὖν.* So also Ewald. Lachmann's reading, which is also followed by Hofmann, must be held to be the *original* one: (1) because amidst the numerous variations it has a decided preponderance of testimony in its favor, for *ᾗ* is wanting in A B C D* ℵ and 9 min., Dam., and *οὖν* after *στήκετε* is written in A B C D* (in the Greek) F G ℵ and some 10 min., Copt. Goth. Aeth. Boern. Vulg. ms. Cyr. Bas. ms. Aug. Ambrosiast.; (2) because from it the origin of the rest of the readings can be explained easily, naturally, and without perjudice to the witnesses—namely, from the endeavor to connect *τῇ ἐλευθ. ἡμ. Χ. ἠλευθ.* immediately with iv. 31. Thus in some cases *τῇ* was merely changed into *ᾗ* (F G, It. Vulg. Goth. and Fathers); in others *ᾗ* was inserted before *ἡμᾶς* (Griesb.), allowing *τῇ* to remain. The relative thus introduced led others, who had in view the right connection with *στήκετε*, either to omit the *οὖν* (after *στήκετε*), which the presence of the relative rendered awkward (E. Vulg. It. Syr. p. Fathers; Griesb., Rück., Tisch.), or to place it immediately after *ἐλευθερίᾳ* (C*** K L, min., Fathers; Elz). Lastly, the transposition *Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς* was an involuntary expedient to place the subject first, but is condemned by the decisive counter-weight of the evidence. It is a dubious view which derives the different readings of our passage from the accidental omission in writing of Η before Η*μας* (Tisch., Wieseler), especially since very ancient witnesses, in which *ᾗ* is wanting, read not *ἡμᾶς Χριστός*, but *Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς* (as C L ℵ** Marcion, Chrys.).—Ver. 3. *πάλιν*] is wanting in D* F G, 73, 74, 76, It. Chrys. Theophyl. Victorin. Jerome, Aug. Ambrosiast. The omission is caused by the similarity of the *παντί* which follows. —Ver. 7. *ἐνέκοψε*] The Elz. reading *ἀνέκοψε* is opposed to all the uncials and most min., and is therefore rightly rejected by Grot., Mill., Bengel, Matth., Lachm., Tisch., Reiche, whereas Usteri sought very feebly to defend it. — The *τῇ* which follows is wanting in A B ℵ*. But the article forms a necessary part of the idea (comp. ii. 5, 14), and the omission must be looked upon as a mere error in copying. Without just ground, Semler and Koppe consider the whole *τῇ ἀληθ. μὴ πείθεσθαι* to be not genuine; and the latter is disposed, instead of it, to defend *μηδενὶ πείθεσθε*, which is found in F G, codd. Lat. in Jer. and some vss. and Fathers, after *πείθεσθαι*, but is manifestly a gloss annexed to the following *ἡ πεισμονή κ.τ.λ.* Still more arbitrarily, Schott holds the whole of ver. 7 to be an inserted gloss. — Ver. 9. *ζυμοῖ*] D* E, Vulg. Clar. Germ. codd. Lat. in Jer. and Sedul., and several Fathers, read *δολοῖ.* Approved by Mill. and

Valck. *Schol.* II. p. 178. An interpretation, because in this passage the leaven represents something corrupting (otherwise in Matt. xiii. 33). Comp. on 1 Cor. v. 6. — Ver. 14. *ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ*] Marcion (in Epiph. and Tert.) read *ὑμῖν*, and D* E F G, It. Ambrosiast. have *ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ*. Marcion's reading is of antinomistic origin (hence he also omitted the following *ἐν τῷ*) ; but the *ὑμῖν* introduced by it became subsequently blended with the original text. — *πληροῦται*] Defended by Reiche ; but A B C ℵ, min., Marcion (in Epiph. and Tert.) Damasc. Aug. read *πεπλήρωται*. Justly ; the meaning of the perfect (which is also adopted by Lachm., Rück., Schott, Tisch.) was not apprehended by mechanical transcribers. — *σεαυτόν*] Elz., Matth., Schott, read *ἑαυτόν*. Certainly in opposition to A B C D E K ℵ, min., and Greek Fathers ; but the pronoun of the second person was very likely to occur to the copyists (in the LXX. Lev. xix. 18, there is the same variety of readings), and indeed the final letter of the foregoing *ὡς* might easily lend support to the *σεαυτόν* : hence *ἑαυτόν* is to be restored, in opposition to Griesb., Scholz, Lachm., Tisch., and others. Comp. on Rom. xiii. 9.—Ver. 17. *ταῦτα δέ*] Lachm. and Schott [Tisch. 1872] read *ταῦτα γάρ*, following ℵ* B D* E F G*, 17, Copt. Vulg. It. and some Fathers. Looking at this preponderance of attestation, and seeing that the continuative *δέ* might easily appear more suitable, *γάρ* is to be preferred. — Ver. 19 f. *μοιχεία*] is wanting before *πορν.* in A B C ℵ *, min., and many vss. and Fathers ; 76, 115, Epiph. Chrys. Theophyl. have it after *πορνεία*. In opposition to Reiche, but with Griesb., Lachm., Scholz, Schott, Tisch., and others, it is to be deleted, since it has been introduced, although at a very early date (It. Or.), most probably by the juxtaposition of the two words in other passages (Matt. xv. 19 ; Mark vii. 21 ; comp. Hos. ii. 2), well known to the transcribers. — *ἔρεις, ζῆλοι*] Lachm. and Tisch. have the singular, following weighty evidence ; the plurals were introduced in conformity to the adjoining. — Ver. 21. *φόνοι*] is wanting in B ℵ, 17, 33, 35, 57, 73, and several Fathers, but in no version. Rejected by Mill., Seml., and Koppe, bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. On account of the similarity of sound with the preceding word it might just as easily be omitted, as it might be added from Rom. i. 29. Hence the preponderance of witnesses determines the point, and that in favor of the retention.

CONTENTS. — Exhortation to steadfastness in Christian freedom, and warning against the opposite course. If they allowed themselves to be circumcised, Christ would profit them nothing, and they would be bound to the law as a whole ; by legal justification they would be severed from Christ and from grace, as is proved by the nature of Christian righteousness (vv. 1–6). Complaint and warning on account of the apostasy of the readers, respecting whom, however, Paul cherishes good confidence ; whereas he threatens judgment against the seducers, whose teaching as to circumcision is in no sense his (vv. 7–12). A warning against the abuse, and an exhortation to the right use, of Christian freedom, which consists in a demeanor actuated by mutual love (vv. 13–15) ; whereupon he then enters into a detailed explanation to the effect that the Holy Spirit, and not the flesh, must be the guiding power of their conduct (vv. 16–25). After this, special moral exhortations begin (ver. 26).

Ver. 1. *Τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν*] On this reading, see the critical notes. The sentence forms, with iv. 31, the basis of the exhortation which follows, *στήκετε οὖν κ.τ.λ.* See on iv. 31. *For freedom*, in order that we should be free and should remain so, that we should not again become subject to bondage, *Christ has set us free* (iv. 1–7), namely, from the bondage of the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* (iv. 3).[1] The dative *τῇ ἐλευθ.* is therefore *commodi*, not *instrumenti*.[2] By so taking it, and by attending to the *emphasis*, which lies not on Χριστός, but on the *τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ* following immediately after *τῆς ἐλευθέρας* in iv. 31, we obviate entirely the objection of Rückert[3] that Paul must have written : Χ. *ἡμᾶς ἐλευθερίᾳ ἠλευθέρωσεν*, or *εἰς ἐλευθ.*, or *τῇ ἐλευθ. ταύτῃ*, or *ἣν ἔχομεν*, or some other addition of the kind. — *στήκετε οὖν*] *stand fast therefore*, namely, in the freedom, which is to be inferred from what goes before ; hence the absence of connection with *τῇ ἐλευθ.* does not produce any obscurity or abruptness.[4] On the absolute *στήκετε*, which obtains its reference from the context, comp. 2 Thess. ii. 15. — *καὶ μὴ πάλιν κ.τ.λ.*] *and be not again held in a yoke of bondage.* Previously they had been (most of them) in the yoke of heathenism ; now they were on the point of being held in the yoke of Mosaism (only another kind of the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*). The yoke is conceived as laid on the neck : Acts xv. 10 ; Ecclus. li. 26 ; Dem. 322. 12 ; Hom. *H. Cer.* 217. As to *πάλιν*, comp. on iv. 9. *δουλείας* denotes the characteristic *quality* belonging to the yoke.[5] — *ἐνέχεσθαι*, with the *dative*[6] or with *ἐν*,[7] is the proper expression for those who are *held* either in a *physical* (net or the like) or *ethical* (law, dogma, emotion, sin, or the like) restriction of liberty, so that they cannot get out.[8] Here, on account of the idea of *a yoke*, the reference is *physical*, but used as a figurative representation for that which is *mental*, which affects the *conscience*.

Note.—If we take the reading of the *Recepta*, and of Griesbach and his followers (see the critical notes), we must explain it : "*In respect the freedom of* [*therefore*], *for which Christ has set us free, stand fast, and become not again, etc.!*" — so that *τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ* is to be taken like *τῇ πίστει* in 2 Cor. i. 24 and Rom. iv. 20, and *ᾗ* as the dative *commodi* (Morus, Winer, Reiche). *ᾗ* might also (with the Vulgate, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Rückert, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, and many others) be taken as *ablative* (instrumentally) : "*qua* nos liberavit," "with which he has freed you," after the analogy of the classical expressions *ζῆν βίῳ, ὗσαι ὕδατι κ.τ.λ.* (Bernhardy, p. 107 ; Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 523 ff.), and of the frequent use both in the LXX. and the N. T. (Winer, p. 434) of "cognate" nouns in the dative. But this mode of expression does not occur elsewhere with Paul, not even in 1 Thess iii. 9. According to Schott, Ewald, and Matthias, who join it to iv. 31 (see the critical notes), we get the meaning : "*We are not children of a bond-maid, but of the free woman through the freedom, with which Christ made us free ; stand fast therefore.*" Thus *τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ᾗ ἡμᾶς Χριστ. ἠλευθ.* becomes a self-evident appendage ; and Χριστός receives an emphasis, just as in iii. 13, which its position does not warrant.

---

[1] Cf. ver. 13 ; John viii. 36.

[2] Comp. also Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 155 ; Holsten, Hofmann, Reithmayr.

[3] Comp. Matthies and Olshausen.

[4] In opposition to Reiche.

[5] Comp. Soph. *Aj.* 924 : πρὸς οἷα δουλείας ζυγὰ χωροῦμεν. Eur. *Or.* 1330 ; Plat. *Legg.* vi. p. 770 E : δούλειον ζυγόν, *Ep.* 8, p. 354 D ; Dem. 322. 12 ; Herod. vii. 8.

[6] Dem. 1231. 15 ; 2 Macc. v. 18 ; 3 Macc. vi. 10.

[7] Dem. 1069. 9.

[8] See Kypke *in loc.*, and Markland *ad Lys.* V. p. 37, Reisk.

Ver. 2. Paul now in a warning tone reveals to them the fearful danger to which they are exposed. This he does by the address *ἴδε* in the singular,[1] exciting the special attention of every individual reader, and with the energetic, defiant interposition of his personal authority : *ἐγὼ Παῦλος*, on which Theophylact well remarks : *τὴν τοῦ οἰκείου προσώπου ἀξιοπιστίαν ἀντὶ πάσης ἀποδείξεως τίθησι*, "Instead of all demonstration he presents the trustworthiness of his own person."[2] — *ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε*] To be pronounced with special emphasis. The readers stood now on the very verge of obeying *thus far*—and therefore to the utmost—the suggestions of the false apostles in taking upon them the yoke of the law, after having already consented to preliminary isolated acts of legal observance (iv. 10). — *Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει*] comp. ii. 21. *Χριστὸς* is emphatically placed first, and immediately after *περιτ.* Chrysostom, moreover, aptly remarks : *ὁ περιτεμνόμενος ὡς νόμον δεδοικὼς περιτέμνεται, ὁ δὲ δεδοικὼς ἀπιστεῖ τῇ δυνάμει τῆς χάριτος, ὁ δὲ ἀπιστῶν οὐδὲν κερδαίνει παρὰ τῆς ἀπιστουμένης*, "He who is circumcised is circumcised as fearing the law, but he who fears the law distrusts the power of grace, and he who distrusts gains nothing from that which he distrusts." On such a footing Christ cannot be Christ, the Mediator of salvation. Paul's judgment presupposes that circumcision is adopted, not as a condition of a holy life,[3] but as a *condition of salvation*, which was the question raised among the Galatians.[4] The *future*, *ὠφελήσει*, which is explained by others[5] as referring to the consequence generally, points to the nearness of the Parousia and the decision of the judgment. Comp. ver. 5 : *ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης*, just as previously the idea of the *κληρονομία* in iv. 30.

Ver. 3. With regard to the judgment just expressed, *Χριστὸς οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς ὠφελήσει*, Paul now, with increasing emotion (*μαρτύρομαι, παντὶ ἀνθρ. περιτ.*), gives an explanation (vv. 3, 4) which clearly discloses the entire certainty of this negation. — The *δέ* is not *potius*,[6] because it is not preceded by any antagonistic assertion, but is the *autem* which leads on to more detailed information.[7] — *μαρτύρομαι*] in the sense of *μαρτυρῶ*, as in Acts xx. 26 ; Eph. iv. 17 ; Joseph. *Bell.* iii. 8. 3 ; and also Plat. *Phil.* p. 47 D, while in classical authors it usually means *to summon as a witness* and *obtestor*. Paul *testifies* that which with divine certainty he *knows*. The context does not warrant us to supply *θεόν*, with Bretschneider and Hilgenfeld. — *πάλιν*] not *contra*, "against,"[8] which is never its meaning,[9] but *again*, not however in the sense that ver. 3 is described as a repetition of what was said in ver. 2,[10] which it is not ; nor in the sense that Paul is thinking merely of the *testifying in itself*, and not of its *purport*,[11]—an interpretation which cannot but be the less natural, the more necessarily as that which is attested *πάλιν* stands in essential inner connection with the axiom which had been previously expressed ("*probatio* est proximae sententiae sumta *ex loco repugnantium*," "The proof of the next sentence is derived from the topic of things that conflict," Calvin); but in the sense that Paul *calls to the remembrance* of his readers *his last presence among them* (the second), when he had already orally assured them of what he here expresses.[1] Comp. on i. 9, iv. 16. — παντὶ ἀνθρ. περιτ.] stands in a climactic relation to the foregoing ὑμῖν, remorselessly embracing *all: to every one* I testify, so that no one may fancy himself excluded from the bearing of the statement. According to Chrysostom and Theophylact, with whom Schott and others agree, Paul has wished to avoid the appearance κατ' ἔχθραν ταῦτα λέγεσθαι; but in this view the whole climactic force of the address is misunderstood. — ὅλον] has the emphasis.[2] Circumcision binds the man who accepts it to obey the *whole* law, because it makes him a full member of the covenant of the law, a proselyte of righteousness, and the law requires from those who are bound to it its entire fulfilment (iii. 10). Probably the pseudo-apostles had sought at least to conceal or to weaken this true and—since no one is able wholly to keep the law,[3]—yet so fearful consequence of accepting circumcision, as if faith in Christ and acceptance of circumcision might be compatible with one another. On the contrary, Paul proclaims the decisive *aut . . . aut*.[4] The state of the man who allows himself to be circumcised stands in a relation *contradictory* to the state of grace.[5]

---

[1] Comp. Soph. *Trach.* 824.

[2] Comp. 2 Cor. x. 1 ; Eph. iii. 1 ; Col. i. 23.

[3] Holsten.

[4] ii. 3, 5 ; Acts xv. 1, xvi. 3. Comp. Lechler, *apost. Zeitalt.* p. 248.

[5] De Wette, Hofmann, and most.

[6] Schott.

[7] Herm. *ad Viger.* p. 845.

[8] Erasmus, Er. Schmid, Koppe, Wahl ; comp. Usteri.

[9] See Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 166 f.

[10] Calvin, Castalio, Calovius, Wolf, Zachariae, Paulus, and others.

[11] Hofmann ; comp. Fritzsche, Winer, de Wette.

Ver. 4. But whosoever is justified through the law—a way of justification which necessarily follows from the already mentioned obligation—is separated from Christ, etc. A complete explanation is thus given as to the Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει. Asyndetic (without δέ), and reverting to the second person, the language of Paul is the more emphatic and vivid. — κατηργήθητε] In the first clause the stress is laid upon the dread *separation* which has befallen them, in the second on the *benefit* thereby lost,—a striking alternation of emphasis. The pregnant expression, καταργεῖσθαι ἀπό τινος,[6] is to be resolved into καταργεῖσθαι καὶ χωρίζεσθαι ἀπό τινος, that is, *to come to nothing in regard to the relation hitherto subsisting with any one, so that we are parted from him.*[7] Hence the sense is: *your connection with Christ is annulled, cancelled:* ἀπεκόπητε.[8] Justification by the law and justification for Christ's sake are in truth *opposita*, "opposites" (works—faith), so that the one *excludes* the other. — οἵτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε] *ye who are being justified through the law.* The directly assertive and present δικαιοῦσθε is said from the mental standpoint of the subjects concerned, in *whose* view of the matter the way of salvation is this: "through the law, with which our conduct agrees (comp. iii. 11), we become just before God." Hence the concrete statement is not to be weakened either by taking δικαιοῦσθαι in the sense of ζητεῖν δικαιοῦσθαι, ii. 17,[9] or by attributing a *hypothetical* sense to οἵτινες.[10]

---

[1] Moldenhauer, Flatt, Rückert, Olshausen, Wieseler.

[2] Comp. Jas. ii. 10.

[3] Acts xiii. 38, xv. 10; Rom. viii. 3.

[4] *Aut . . . aut* indicates an exclusive alternative. If one member be true, the other must be false.

[5] Comp. Rom. vi. 14 f., xi. 6.

[6] Comp. Rom. ix. 3; 2 Cor. xi. 3; see generally, Fritzsche *ad Rom.* II. p. 250.

[7] Just the same in Rom. vii. 2, 6.

[8] Oecumenius.

[9] Rückert, Baumgarten-Crusius, and earlier expositors.

[10] Hofmann, who erroneously compares Thuc. v. 16. 1.

Whomsoever Paul *hits* with his οἵτινες κ.τ.λ., he also *means.* — τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε] that is, ye *have forfeited* the relation of being *objects* of divine *grace.* The opposite : ὑπὸ χάριν εἶναι (Rom. vi. 14), to which divine grace faith has led (Rom. v. 2).[1] Whoever becomes righteous by obedience to the law, becomes so no longer by the grace of God,[2] but by works acccording to desert ;[3] so that thus his relation of grace towards God (which is *capable of being lost*) has *ceased.*

Ver. 5. Ground *e contrario*, "on the contrary," for the judgment passed in ver. 4 on those becoming righteous by the law ; derived, not generally from what makes up the essence of the Christian state,[4] but specially from the specific way in which *Paul and those like him* expect to be justified. The reasoning presupposes the certainity, of which the apostle was conscious, that the ἡμεῖς are those who are *not* separated from Christ and have *not* fallen from grace. — ἡμεῖς] *we*, on our part : "qui a nobis dissentiunt, habeant sibi," "Let those who differ from us keep their views to themselves," Bengel. — πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως] is not (with Luther) to be considered as one idea ("*Spiritu qui ex fide est*," "through the Spirit who is of faith)," since there is no contrast with any other spirit, but rather as *two* points opposed to the ἐν νόμῳ in ver. 4 : "*by means of the Spirit, from faith*, we expect," etc. ; so that the Holy Spirit is the divine *agent*, and faith in Christ is the subjective *source* of our expectation.[5] We must not therefore explain πνεύματι either as the *spirit of man simply*,[6] or (comp. on Rom. viii. 4) as the *spiritual nature of man sanctified* by the Holy Spirit ;[7] but similarly to ver. 16, as the *objective* πνεῦμα ἅγιον, which is the divine principle of spiritual life in Christians, and which they have received ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως.[8] And the Holy Spirit is the divine mainspring of Christian hope, as being the potential source of all Christian dispositions and of Christian life in general, and as the earnest and surety of eternal life in particular.[9] —ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχ.] ἀπεκδέχεσθαι (Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25 ; 1 Cor. i. 7 ; Phil. iii. 20 ; 1 Pet. iii. 20) does not indeed denote that he who waits *is wholly spent* in waiting,[10] but rather[11] the persistent *awaiting*, which does not slacken until the time of realization.[12] The genitive δικαιοσύνης is not *appositionis*, "one of apposition,"[13] so that the sense would be : "*the righteousness hoped for by us*," the genitive with ἐλπίς never being used in this way ; but it is the objective genitive : *the hope of being justified*, namely, in the judgment, where we shall be declared by Christ as righteous. At variance with the context, since justification *itself* is in question (see ver. 4) [See Note LXVIII., p. 243], others understand it as the subjective genitive, as that *which righteousness has to hope for*,[1] that is, the *hoped for reward of righteousness*, namely, eternal life.[2] The fact that the δικαιοσύνη itself—that is, the righteousness of *faith*, and not that of a holy *life*,[3]—is presented as something *future*, need not in itself surprise us, because during the temporal life it exists indeed through faith, but may nevertheless be lost (see vv. 2, 4), and is not yet a *definitive* possession, which it only comes to be at the judgment (Rom. viii. 33 f.). In a corresponding way, the υἱοθεσία, although it has been already entered upon through faith (iii. 26, iv. 5), is also the object of hope (Rom. viii. 23). This at the same time explains why Paul *here* speaks in particular of an ἐλπὶς δικαιοσύνης ; he thereby indicates the difference between the *certainty of salvation* in the consciousness (Rom. viii. 24) of the true Christians, and the confidence, dependent upon works, felt by the legally righteous, who say : ἐν νόμῳ δικαιούμεθα, because in their case the becoming righteous is something in a continuous *course of growth* by means of meritorious obedience to the law. Lastly, the expression ἀπεκδέχεσθαι ἐλπίδα is not to be explained by the supposition that Paul, when he wrote ἐλπίδα, had it in his mind to make ἔχομεν follow,[4]—an interpretation which is all the more arbitrary, because there is no intervening sentence which might divert his thought,—but the hope is treated *objectively*,[5] so that ἀπεκδέχεσθαι ἐλπίδα belongs to the category of the familiar expressions ζῆν βίον, πιστεύειν δόξαν :[6] ἐλπίδα. . . προσδοκᾶσθαι. The Catholic doctrine of the *gradual increase of righteousness*[7] is entirely un-Pauline, although favored by Romang, Hengstenberg, and others. Justification does not, like sanctification, develop itself and increase ; but it has, as its moral consequence (iv. 6), sanctification through the Spirit which is given to him who is justified by faith. Thus Christ is to us δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμός, 1 Cor. i. 30.

---

[1] On the figurative ἐκπίπτειν, comp. 2 Pet. iii. 17 ; Plut. *Gracch.* 21 : ἐκπεσεῖν καὶ στέρεσθαι τῆς πρὸς τὸν δῆμον εὐνοίας, Polyb. xii. 14. 7 ; Lucian, *Cont.* 14 ; Ecclus. xxxi. 4.

[2] δωρεάν, Rom. iii. 24.

[3] Rom. iv. 11, 16, xi. 6.

[4] Hofmann.

[5] On πνεύματι, comp. Rom. vii. 6, viii. 4, 15 f., Eph. i. 13 f., ii. 22, *et al.;* and on ἐκ πίστεως, comp. ii. 16, iv. 22, Rom. i. 17, iii. 22, ix. 30, x. 6, *et al*

[6] With Grotius, Borger, Fritzsche, and others.

[7] Winer, Paulus, Rückert, and others ; comp. Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hofmann.

[8] iii. 2, 5, iv. 6.

[9] 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5 ; Eph. i. 14 ; Rom. viii. 11, 23.

[10] Hofmann.

[11] Comp. generally Winer, *de verb. compos.* IV. p. 14.

[12] C. F. A. Fritzsche in *Fritzschior. Opusc.* p. 156.

[13] Wieseler.

Ver. 6. Warrant for the ἐκ πίστεως : *for in Christ Jesus*, in fellowship with Christ (in the relation of the ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι), *neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any avail ;* the fact of a man being or not being circumcised is of no influence, *but faith, which is operative through love*, sc. ἰσχύει τι. The τι ἰσχύει is to be left in the same general and unlimited form in which it stands. Circumcision and uncircumcision are circumstances of no effect or avail in Christianity. And yet they were in Galatia the points on which the disturbance turned ! On the *faith active in love*, which is the effective saving element in the state of the Christian, comp. 1 Tim. i. 5 ; 1 Thess. i.

---

[1] Hofmann, in fact, arrives at the same result, although he rejects the interpretation of the genitive as the *gen. subjecti :* "To wait for the *blessing of righteousness* already prepared for him, *which constitutes the substance of his hope*,"—consequently for the στέφανος of his δικαιοσύνη, 2 Tim. iv. 8 (see Huther *in loc.* ed. 3).

[2] So Pelagius, Beza, Piscator, Hunnius, Calovius, Bengel, Rambach, Baumgarten, Zachariae, Koppe, Borger, Paulus, Windischmann, Reithmayr, and others ; comp. also Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* pp. 333, 341.

[3] Holsten.

[4] Winer, Usteri, Schott.

[5] Comp. on Col. i. 5 ; Rom. viii. 24 ; Heb. vi. 18.

[6] Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 501 ff. Comp. Acts xxiv. 15 : ἐλπίδα . . . ἣν καὶ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι προσδέχονται, Tit. ii. 13 ; Job ii. 9 ; Isa. xxviii. 10 ; 2 Macc. vii. 14 ; Eur. *Alc.* 130 : νῦν δὲ τίν' ἔτι βίου ἐλπίδα προσδέχωμαι ; Dem. 1468. 13.

[7] *Trident.* vi. 10. 24, Döllinger.

3; 1 Cor. xiii.; also Jas. ii. 22. By means of this faith man is καινὴ κτίσις, vi. 15. Bengel well says: "Cum *fide* conjunxit ver. 5, *spem*, nunc *amorem*; in his stat totus Christianismus," "with *faith*, he joined in v. 5 *hope*, and now *love*; in these all Christianity consists." How very necessary it was for the Galatians that prominence should be given to the activity of faith *in love*, may be seen from vv. 15, 20, 26. The *passive* view of ἐνεργουμ., which is given by the Fathers and many Catholics, such as Bellarmine, Estius, Reithmayr, in whom the interest of dogmatic controversy against the Protestants came to a great extent into play, is erroneous, because ἐνεργεῖσθαι in the N. T. is *always middle* (*vim suam exserere*), "to exert its force."[1] It does not mean, "*having been rendered energetic through love*,"[2] but *working* through love, expressing thereby its vital power. Moreover, our passage is not at variance with justification *solely* by faith: "*opera fieri* dicit ex fide per caritatem, non *justificari* hominem per caritatem," "He says that works are done from faith by love, not that man is justified by love," Luther. Comp. Calovius: "*Formatam*[3] etiam fidem apostolus refellit, cum non per caritatem *formam* suam accipere vel *formari*, sed per caritatem *operosam* vel *efficacem* esse docet. Caritatem ergo et opera non fidem *constituere*, sed *consequi* et ex eadem *fluere* certum est," "The Apostle also refutes *fides formata*, since he teaches that it does not receive its *form*, neither is it *formed* by love, but that through love it is active or efficacious. It is certain, therefore, that love and works do not constitute faith, but follow it, and flow from it." It must, however, be observed that love (the opposite of all selfishness) must be, from its nature, the continuous *moral medium* of the operation in faith in those who are thereby justified,[4] 1 Cor. xiii. 1 ff.[5]

Vv. 7–9. How naturally—and, in conformity with the apostle's lively emotion, asyndetically—the utterance of this axiom of the Christian character and life, which the readers had formerly obeyed, is followed by disapproving surprise at the fact that they had not remained faithful to it (ver. 7), and then by renewed warning against the false teachers, based on the ungodly nature (ver. 8) and the destructive influence (ver. 9) of their operations! — ἐτρέχετε καλῶς] that is, your Christian behavior—your Christian life and effort—was in course of excellent development. A figurative mode of presenting the activity of spiritual life very frequently used by the apostle.[6] — τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψε] A question of surprise (comp. iii. 1): *who hindered you?*[7] In Polyb. xxi. 1. 12 it is used with the dative. So also Hippocr. pp. 28, 35; for it means properly: to make an incision. — τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι] *from obeying the truth*, that is, the true gospel, according to which faith alone is that which justifies. μή is employed, as usual, after verbs of hindering.[1] The *infinitive* with μή denotes that which, so far as the will of the hinderer is concerned, shall not take place. — ἡ πεισμονὴ κ.τ.λ.] After the surprise comes the *warning*.[2] Whether, however, the word is to be understood *actively*, as *persuasion*, or *passively*, as *compliance*, is a point which must be decided in the several passages by the context. In this passage it is understood as *persuasion* by MSS. of the Itala (*suasio*), Vulgate (*persuasio*), Erasmus, Castalio, Calvin, Beza, Cornelius à Lapide, Wolf, Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, Borger, Flatt, Paulus, Usteri, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Matthias, Holsten, and others; on the other hand, Chrysostom,[3] Oecumenius,[4] Theophylact,[5] Luther (1519 and 1524; but in 1538, and in his translation: *such persuasion*), and others,[6] explain it as *compliance*,[7] which, however, does not fit the word used absolutely. The latter rather yields the thought: *The persuasion is not of your caller*, is not a thing proceeding from God (see, on the contrary, 2 Cor. xi. 15). Paul would have this applied to the mode of operation of the pseudo-apostles, who worked upon the Galatians *by persuasion* (talking over), so that they did not remain obedient to the truth, but turned ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος αὐτοὺς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ to an ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον (i. 6). If it were to be taken as *compliance*, some more precise definition must have been appended;[8] because compliance is ungodly not in itself, but only according to the nature of the demand, the motive, and the moral circumstances generally. Some have made it to mean *credulitas*, "credulity,"[9] but the sense of the word is thus altered. The *talking over*, however, did not need anything added, since it is *of itself*, in matters of faith at any rate, objectionable; hence it was very superfluous in Luther, Grotius, and many others, to take the article as *demonstrative*. Moreover, the active sense is excellently adapted to the designation of God by ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς, inasmuch as the *talking over* is a mode of operating on men characteristically different from the divine *calling*: the former not befitting the divine dignity like the latter ; the former bound up with human premeditation, art, and importunity, taking place ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις (1 Cor. ii. 4), counteracting free self-determination, and so forth.[1] Bengel, Morus, and de Wette understand it as *obstinacy* (the "clinging to prejudices," de Wette), making it correspond with the foregoing τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι. So also Ewald, although translating it as *self-confidence*, and comparing πίσυνος. But the passages cited above from Eustathius do not make good this signification ; and, in particular, *Od.* x. p. 785. 22, is quite improperly adduced in its favor.[2] Reiche, preferring the signification *compliance*, takes the sentence as *asking* indignantly : "Annon assensus, obsequium veritati praestandum e Deo est, qui vos vocavit ?" "Is not then assent, obedience to the truth to be rendered from God, who has called you ?" But why should Paul have expressed this by the singular word πεισμονή not used by him elsewhere, instead of the current and unambiguous πίστις or ὑπακοὴ τῆς πίστεως ? By employing the latter, he would, in fact, have also suited the foregoing πείθεσθαι. — The καλῶν ὑμᾶς is neither *Christ*[3] nor *the apostle*,[4] but *God.*[5] The *present* participle is not to be understood of a *continuing* call "*ad resipiscentiam*," "to repentance,"[6] a view at variance with the constant use of the absolute καλεῖν,[7] nor does it represent the calling as lasting up to the time of their yielding compliance against the truth,[8] which would be an idea foreign to the N. T. ;[9] but it is to be taken *substantivally*, *your caller*, the definition of the time being left out of view.[10] God, the *caller* to everlasting salvation, has assigned to every one, by calling him at his conversion,[11] the "*normam totius cursus*," "rule of his entire course" (Bengel). — μικρὰ ζύμη κ.τ.λ.] The meaning of this proverbial warning (see on 1 Cor. v. 6) is : "If the false apostles have, by means of their persuasion, succeeded in making even but a small beginning in the work of imparting to you erroneous doctrines or false principles, this will develop itself to the corruption of your whole Christian faith and life." So, taking the figure with reference to *doctrine*, in substance also Chrysostom, Theophylact (who, however, explain μικρὰ ζύμη too specially of *circumcision*), Luther, Calvin, Cornelius à Lapide, and many others, including Flatt and Matthies. It is true that the dogma of his opponents was in itself fundamentally subversive (as Wieseler objects) ; but its *influence* had not yet so far developed itself, that the ζύμη might not have been still designated relatively as μικρά. Others interpret it as referring to *persons* : "vel pauci homines perperam docentes possunt omnem coetum corrumpere," "even a few men teaching erroneously can corrupt an entire body," Winer ;[12] but against this it may be urged that the *number* of the false teachers, as it is in itself a matter of indifference, and does not acquire greater significance through their having intruded themselves from without, remains also unnoticed throughout the epistle, and the point in question was solely the *influence of their teaching* (comp. πεισμονή), which was the leaven threatening to spread destructively.[1]

---

[1] See on 2 Cor. i. 6; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* vii. 6, II. p. 18.

[2] Reithmayr.

[3] The "fides *formata*" is also found here by Bisping, and especially Reithmayr, following the *Trid. Sess.* vi. 7, *de justif.* See, on the other hand, *Apol. Conf. Aug* p. 81 f. [*Book of Concord* (Jacobs), p. 102 f.]

[4] Comp. also Dorner, *Gesch. d. prot. Theol.* p. 232 ff.

[5] Comp. Lipsius, *Rechtfert.* p. 192; Romang, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, p. 90 ff., who, however, concedes too much to the idea of *fides formata*.

[6] Comp. ii. 2; Phil. iii. 11.

[7] Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 18; Rom. xv. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 7.

---

[1] See Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 810 f.; Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 867; Winer, p. 561.

[2] ἡ πεισμονή occurs again only in Apoll. *Synt.* p. 195. 10, in Eustath. (*Il.* ι, p. 637. 5, α, pp. 21, 26, *et al.*; see Wetstein), and in the Fathers (Ignat. *ad Rom.* 3 *interpol.*; Just. Mart. *Ap.* I. 53, p. 87; Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 21; Chrysostom, *ad* 1 Thess. i. 4.

[3] οὐκ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς ὁ καλῶν, ὥστε οὕτω σαλεύεσθαι, "He who called you did not call you on these conditions in order that you thus waver."

[4] τὸ πεισθῆναι τοῖς λέγουσιν ὑμῖν περιτέμνεσθαι, "to be persuaded by those bidding you be circumcised."

[5] τὸ πείθεσθαι τοῖς ἀπατῶσιν, "to obey those deceiving."

[6] Including Morus, Winer, Rückert, Matthies, Olshausen, Reiche, Hofmann, Reithmayr.

[7] This view serves to explain the omission of the οὐκ in D*, min., Cod. lat. in Jer. and Sedul. Clar. Germ. Or. (once), Lucifer. Theodoret also appears not to have read it, as he gives the explanation: ἴδιον Θεοῦ τὸ καλεῖν, τὸ δὲ πείθεσθαι τῶν ἀκουόντων, "it is the prerogative of God to call; of the hearers, to obey."

[8] At least ὑμῶν, which is actually read by Syr. Erp. codd. in Jer. Lucif. Aug. Ambrosiast. Sedul. Arm. has αὕτη γὰρ πεισμονή. Vömel and Hofmann seek to remove the indefiniteness by reading instead of the article the relative ἥ: *which* obedience. But, according to this view, ἡ πεισμ. must have been correlative to the foregoing πείθεσθαι (comp. Wisd. xvi. 2), and this consequently must have been defined not negatively, but positively, somewhat as if Paul, instead of τῇ ἀληθ. μὴ πείθεσθαι, had written ἑτέρῳ εὐαγγελίῳ πείθεσθαι. But having written τ. ἀληθ. μὴ πείθεσθαι, he must, in correlation with μὴ πείθεσθαι, have continued relatively with ἡ ἀπείθεια.

[9] Estius, Winer, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others.

---

[1] Comp. Soph. *Fragm.* 744, Dind.: δεῖνον τὸ τᾶς Πειθοῦς πρόσωπον. Aesch. *Agam.* 385: βιᾶται δ' ἁ τάλαινα πειθώ.

[2] See Reiche, p. 79 f.

[3] Theophylact, Erasmus, Michaelis, and others.

[4] Locke, Paulus.

[5] See on i. 6.

[6] Beza.

[7] i. 6, v. 13 ; Rom. viii. 30, *et al.*

[8] Hofmann.

[9] i. 6 ; Weiss. *bibl. Theol.* p. 386 f.

[10] Comp. 1 Thess. v. 24 ; Winer, p. 331.

[11] Phil. iii. 14.

[12] Comp. Theodoret, Jerome, Augustine, Erasmus, Grotius, Estius, Locke, Bengel, Borger, Paulus, Usteri, Schott, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann, Windischmann, Reithmayr, and others.

Ver. 10. After the warning in vv. 8, 9, Paul now assures his readers how he cherishes confidence in them, that their sentiments would be in conformity with this warning ; but those who led them astray would meet with punishment. — ἐγώ] with emphasis : *I on my part*, however much my opponents may think that they have won over your judgment to their side. Groundlessly and arbitrarily Rückert affirms that what Paul *says* is not altogether what he *means*, namely, "I indeed have done all that was possible, so that I may be allowed to hope," etc. — εἰς ὑμᾶς] *towards you.*[2] Usually with the dative or ἐπί. — ἐν κυρίῳ] *In Christ*, in whom Paul lives and moves, he feels also that his confidence rests and is grounded.[3] — οὐδὲν ἄλλο] is referred by most expositors, including Luther, Calvin, Winer, Rückert, Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ewald, to the previous purport of the epistle generally as directed against Judaism. But what is there to warrant this vague reference ? The warning which immediately precedes in vv. 8, 9 (not ver. 7, to which Wieseler, Hofmann, and others arbitrarily go back) has the first claim to have οὐδὲν ἄλλο referred to it, and is sufficiently important for the reference. The antithesis ὁ δὲ ταράσσων also suits very appropriately the subjects of that warning, ἡ πεισμονή and ζύμη, both of which terms characterize the action of the seducers. Usteri interprets : that ye will not allow *any other than your hitherto subsisting* sentiments." No, *a change*, that is, a correction of the sentiments previously existing, is precisely what Paul hopes for. — φρονήσετε] ye will have no other *sentiments* (the practical determination of thought). The *future* (comp. vi. 16) refers to the time when the letter would be received. Hitherto, by their submissiveness towards those who were troubling them, they seemed to have given themselves up to another mode of thinking, which was not the right one.[4] — ὁ δὲ ταράσσων ὑμᾶς] The *singular* denotes not, as in 2 Cor. xi. 4, the *totum genus*, but, as is more appropriate to the subsequent ὅστις ἂν ᾖ, the *individual* who happened to be the troubler *in each actual case.*[5] The idea that the apostle refers to the *chief person* among his opponents, who was well known to him,[6]—formerly even guessed at by name, and identified with Peter himself (Jerome),—has no warrant in the epistle. See, on the contrary, even ver. 12, and compare i. 7, iv. 17. — ὅστις ἂν ᾖ] is to be left entirely general : *without distinction of personal position*, be he, when the case occurs, who he will. The reference to *high repute*[7] would only be warranted, if *ὁ ταράσσ.* applied definitely to some particular person. — *τὸ κρῖμα*] the *judicial sentence κατ' ἐξοχήν*, that is, the condemnatory sentence of the (impending) last judgment.[1] Of *excommunication*[2] the context contains nothing.[3] — *βαστάσει*] the judicial sentence is conceived as something *heavily laid on*,[4] which the condemned one *carries* away as he leaves the judgment-seat. The idea of *λαμβάνειν κρῖμα*[5] is not altogether the same.

---

[1] Comp. i. 7 ff., iii. 1.

[2] Comp. Wisd. xvi. 24.

[3] Comp. Phil. ii. 24 ; 2 Thess. iii. 4 ; Rom. xiv. 14.

[4] ἄλλο, comp. Lys. *in Eratosth.* 48 ; ἕτερος is more frequently thus used, see on Phil. iii. 15.

[5] Comp. Bernhardy, p. 315.

[6] Erasmus, Luther, Pareus, Estius, Bengel, Rückert, Olshausen, Ewald, and others ; comp. also Usteri.

[7] Theodoret, Theophylact, Luther, Estius, and many others ; including Koppe, Flatt, Rückert, de Wette.

Ver. 11. *But I*, on my part. The Judaistic teachers, whom the apostle thus confronts, had,[6] as is evident from our passage—with the view of weakening the hindrance, which among Pauline churches they could not but encounter in the authority of the apostle opposing them—alleged (perhaps making use of Timothy's circumcision, Acts xvi. 3, for this purpose) that Paul himself still (in other churches) preached *circumcision ;* that is, that, when Gentiles went over to Christianity, they should allow themselves to be circumcised. This calumny[7] was sufficiently absurd to admit of his dismissing it, as he does here, with all brevity, and with what a striking experimental proof ! [See Note LXIX., p. 243.] *But if I am still preaching circumcision, wherefore am I still persecuted ?* For the persecution on the part of the Jews was based on the very fact of the *atagonism to the law*, which characterized his preaching of the *Crucified One.* See the sequel. — *εἰ περιτομὴν ἔτι κηρύσσω*] Paul might also have said, *εἰ π. ἐ. ἐκήρυσσον, τ. ἐ. ἐδιωκόμην ἄν*, for he means what *objectively* is *not a real* matter of fact. But he transfers himself directly into the *thought of his opponents*, and just as directly shows its absurdity ; he assumes the reality *of what his opponents asserted*, and then by the apodosis annuls it as preposterous : hence the sense cannot be, as it is defined by Holsten, that his persecution on account of no longer preaching circumcision had not, possibly, the alleged pretext of making the Gentiles complete members of the theocracy, but only the one motive of national vanity and selfishness, to annul the offence of the cross.[8] — The emphasis is laid on *περιτομήν* ; but *ἔτι*, *still*,[9] does not convey the idea that Paul, *as apostle*, had formerly preached circumcision. For although the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit produced in none of the apostles at once and absolutely the laying aside of all religious error previously cherished, but led them forward by gradual and individual development into the whole truth;[1] yet in the case of Paul especially, just because he was converted in the midst of his zealotry for the law, the assumption that he had still preached the necessity of circumcision for salvation, and had thus done direct homage to the fundamental error opposed to the revelation of God in him (i. 15), and to His gospel which had been revealed to him (i. 11 f.), would be quite *unpsychological*. And in a *historical* point of view it would be at variance with the decidedly antinomistic character of his whole apostolic labors as known to us,[2] as well as with the circumstance that the requirement of circumcision in the case of the Gentile Christians, Acts xv., came upon the apostolical church as something quite new and unheard of, and therefore produced so much excitement, and in fact occasioned the apostolic conference. In a purely exegetical point of view, moreover, such an assumption is not compatible with τι ἔτι διώκομαι, because we should thereby be led to the inference that, so long as Paul preached circumcision, he had *not* been persecuted; and yet at the very beginning of his Christian labors he was persecuted by the Jews.[3] Rückert[4] is of opinion that in using ἔτι they only mean to say that Paul, although he preached Christ, required *that, notwithstanding this, they should still allow themselves to be circumcised*. Comp. Olshausen, who refers ἔτι to the *inferiority of the tendency*. But in Olshausen's view, the reference to an earlier κηρύττειν περιτομήν still remains unremoved; and in that of Rückert, the ἔτι is unwarrantably withdrawn from the apostle and passed over to the side of those to whom he preached. Even if (with Hofmann[5]) we understand the ἔτι as in contradistinction to the earlier time, *when the preaching of circumcision had been of general occurrence and had been in its due place*, the reference of this ἔτι is transferred to *a general practice of the earlier time*, although, according to the words of the apostle, it clearly and distinctly assumes *his own* previous κήρυσσειν περιτ. The *correct* view is the *usual* one, adopted also by Winer, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Wieseler, that ἔτι points back *to the period before the conversion of the apostle*. Certainly the objection is made,[6] that Paul at that time, as a Jew among Jews, and coming in contact with Jewish Christians only, had no occasion at all to preach circumcision. But looking at our slight acquaintance with the circumstances of the apostle's pre-Christian life, this conclusion is formed much too rashly. For, as ζηλωτής for God and the law,[1] Saul, who was an energetic and[2] esteemed Pharisaic Rabbi, might often have had occasion enough to preach and to defend circumcision, partly in the interest of proselytizing, and partly also in polemic conflict with Christians in and beyond Judaea, who maintained that their faith, and not their circumcision, was the cause of salvation. — τί ἔτι διώκομαι ;] This ἔτι also, which by most[3] is taken as *logical*, as in Rom. iii. 7, ix. 19, cannot without arbitrary procedure be understood otherwise than as *temporal:* "Why am I *yet always* persecuted ?" Why have they *not yet ceased* to persecute me ?" They could not but in fact have seen how groundless this διώκειν was ! — ἄρα κατήργηται κ.τ.λ.] ἄρα is, as always, *igitur, rebus sic se habentibus*, "*therefore, as matters are*" (if, namely, I still preach circumcision). Paul gives information concerning the foregoing question,—how far, namely, there no longer existed any cause, etc. : *thus therefore is the offence of the cross done away*, that is, the occasion for the rejection of the gospel, which is afforded by the circumstance that the death of Christ on the cross is preached as the only ground of salvation.[4] If Paul had at the same time preached circumcision also as necessary to salvation, then would the Jew have seen his law upheld, and the cross would have been inoffensive to him ; but when, according to his decisive principle, ii. 21, he preached the death of the cross as the end of the law (iii. 13 ; Rom. x. 3, *et al.*), and rejected all legal righteousness—then the Jew took offence at the cross, and rejected the faith.[5] To take it as an *interrogation*[6]—with which the accentuation might have been ἀρα (comp. on ii. 17)—appears logically not inappropriate after τί ἔτι διώκομαι, but yields a less *striking* continuation of the discourse.

---

[1] Comp. Rom. ii. 3, iii. 8 ; 1 Cor. xi. 29.

[2] Locke, Borger.

[3] Jatho also explains the word as referring to this and other ecclesiastical penalties. But it was not the manner of the apostle to call for the discipline of the church in so indirect and veiled a fashion (comp. 1 Cor. v.).

[4] 2 Kings xviii. 14.

[5] Rom. xiii. 2 ; Jas. iii. 1 ; Luke xx. 47, *et al.*

[6] See Chrysostom.

[7] Comp. also Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 216 ff.

[8] Holsten has, in a special excursus (*z. Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr.* p. 337 ff.), acutely explained his interpretation, and endeavored to vindicate it. At the close he puts it in this shape : "Paul wishes to denounce to the Galatians the *secret*, unexpressed ground of his persecution on the part of his opponents : '*I, dear brethren, am only persecuted because I no longer preach circumcision ; for, if I still preach it as the divine will, why am I still persecuted ?— Thus indeed is the offence of the cross annulled !*'" But still Paul must have had some special inducement for proposing, in εἰ κ.τ.λ., a notoriously non-real case as a logical reality ; and this inducement could only be found in the corresponding accusation of his opponents. Otherwise it would be difficult to see why he should not have thrown his language into such a form, that the protasis should have begun either with εἰ and the imperfect or with ὅτι (*because*), and the expression of the apodoses should have undergone corresponding modification. According to Holsten's view, the words have a dialectic enigmatical obscurity, which, looking at the simplicity of the underlying idea, would be without motive.

[9] See Schneider, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 449 C.

---

[1] See Lücke's apt remarks on John ii. 10, p. 501.

[2] Comp. Acts xxi. 21.

[3] Acts ix. 24 f.; 2 Cor. xi. 32 f.

[4] Comp. Baumgarten-Crusius and de Wette.

[5] According to Hofmann, the apostle's meaning is, "that they would have no longer any cause for persecuting him, so soon as his preaching of Jesus Christ should be that, which it is not—a continuance of the preaching of circumcision at the present time." This is also unsuitable, because εἰ would introduce a *sumtio ficti*, "the assumption of what is false," and that indeed in the view of Paul himself. Certainly εἰ with the present indicative might be so put; but in the apodosis the optative with ἄν must have been used, as is the case in the passages compared by Hofmann himself (Xen. *Anab.* vii. 6. 15, v. 6. 12. See also *Memor.* ii. 2. 3; Bornemann, *ad Sympos.* 4. 10, 5. 7; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 487).

[6] See Reithmayr and Hofmann.

Ver. 12. The vivid realization of the doings of his opponents, who were not ashamed to resort even to such falsehood (ver. 11), now wrings from his soul a strong and bitterly sarcastic wish[7] of holy indignation : *Would that they, who set you in commotion, might mutilate themselves !* that they who attach so much importance to circumcision, and thereby create commotion among you, might not content themselves with being circumcised, but might even have themselves emasculated ! On ὄφελον as a *particle*, see on 1 Cor. iv. 8. "Omnino autem observandum est ("It is generally to be observed that") ὤφελον[8] non nisi tum adhiberi, quum quis optat, ut fuerit aliquid, vel sit, vel futurum sit, quod non fuit aut est aut futurum est," "is employed only when one desires something to have been, or to be in the present or future, which has not been, or is not, or will not be," Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 756. It is but very seldom used with the *future*, as

---

[1] Acts xxii. 3 ; comp. Gal. i. 14 ; Phil. iii. 5.

[2] Comp. Acts xxii. 4, 5.

[3] Including de Wette and Wieseler.

[4] 1 Cor. i. 23 ; Phil. iii. 18.

[5] Comp. Chrysostom and Theophylact.

[6] Syr., Bengel on ver. 12, Usteri, Ewald, and others.

[7] According to Hofmann, indeed, it is "*quite earnestly* meant," and is supposed to contain the thought that "their perversity, which is now rendered dangerous by their being able to appeal to the revealed law, would thereby assume a shape in which it would cease to be dangerous." How arbitrarily the thought is imported ! And yet the wish, if *earnestly* meant, would be at all events a *silly* one. For a similar instance of a bitterly pointed saying against the Judaistic overvaluing of circumcision, see Phil. iii. 2.

[8] As to the form ὄφελον, see Interpr. *ad Moer.* p. 285 f.

Lucian, *Soloec.* 1.[1] — *καί*] the *climactic* "*even*," not that of the corresponding relation of retribution,[2] in which sense it would be only superfluous and cumbrous. — *ἀποκόψονται*] denotes *castration*,[3] either by incision of the *vena seminalis* (Deut. xxiii. 1) or otherwise.[4] Owing to *καί*, which, after ver. 11, points to something more than the circumcision therein indicated, this interpretation is the only one suited to the context: it is followed by Chrysostom and his successors, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Cajetanus, Grotius, Estius, Wetstein, Semler, Koppe, and many others; also Winer, Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Hofmann, Reithmayr, Holsten; comp. Ewald, who explains it of a still more complete mutilation, as does Pelagius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and others. In opposition to the context, others, partly influenced by an incorrect aesthetical standard,[5] and sacrificing the middle signification,—which is always reflexive in Greek prose writers,[6] and is also to be maintained throughout in the N. T.[7] — have found in it the sense: "*exitium* imprecatur impostoribus," "He imprecates destruction against impostors;" [8] or have explained it of the *divine extirpation;* [9] or: "may they be *excommunicated;* [10] or: may *all opportunity* of perverting you be *taken* from them;" [11] or: "may they *cut themselves off from you.*" [12] [See Note LXX., p. 244.] — *ἀναστατοῦν*] stronger than *ταράσσειν*, means here *to stir up* (against true Christianity), to *alarm.*[13] The word, used instead of the classic *ἀνάστατον ποιεῖν*, belongs to the later Greek.[14]

Ver. 13. "It is with justice that I speak so indignantly against those men; for *ye*, who are being worked upon by them to bring you under the bondage of the law, have received God's call to the Messianic kingdom for an object entirely different, — in order that ye may be free." Thus the apostle again reminds his readers of the great benefit already indicated in ver. 1, but now with the view of inculcating its single necessary moral limitation. — *ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ*] *that ye should be free; ἐπί* used of the ethical *aim* of the *καλεῖν*.[15] — *μόνον μὴ κ.τ.λ.*] Limiting exhortation. But the verb, which is obvious of itself (τρέπετε, perhaps, or even ἔχετε), is omitted, the omission rendering the address more compact and precise.[1] This also corresponds (in opposition to Hofmann's groundless doubt) to the usage of the Greeks after the prohibitory μή.[2]— εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί] *for an occasion to the flesh;* do not use your liberty so that it may serve as an occasion for the non-spiritual, psychico-corporeal part of your nature to assert its desires which are contrary to God.[3] As to σάρξ in the ethical sense, see Rom. iv. 1, vi. 19, vii. 14; John iii. 6. —ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλ. ἀλλήλ] but let *love* (through which your faith must work, ver. 6) be that by means of which ye stand in a *relation* of mutually rendered *service.* An ingenious juxtaposition of *freedom* and *brotherly serviceableness* in that freedom.[4] The *special* contrast, however, which is here opposed to the *general* category of the σάρξ, has its *ground* in the circumstances of the Galatians, and its *warrant* in what is about to be said of love in ver. 14.

---

[1] See Hermann *l. c.*; Graev. *ad Luc. Sol.* II. p. 730.

[2] Wieseler.

[3] Arrian, *Epict.* ii. 20. 19.

[4] See the passages in Wetstein. Comp. *ἀπόκοπος*, *castrated*, Strabo, xiii. p. 630; *ἀποκεκομμένος*, Deut. xxiii. 1.

[5] Comp. Calovius: "glossa impura," "an impure gloss."

[6] Kühner, II. p. 19.

[7] Winer, p. 239.

[8] Calvin, acknowledging, however, the word as an allusion to circumcision; Calovius, and others.

[9] Wieseler.

[10] Erasmus, Beza, Piscator, Cornelius à Lapide, Bengel, Michaelis, Zachariae, Morus Baumgarten-Crusius, Windischmann, and others; Luther, in his translation, rendered it: *to be extirpated* (thus like Calvin); in his Commentary, 1519, he does not explain it specially, but speaks merely of a curse which is expressed. In 1524, however, he says characteristically: "Si omnino volunt circumcidi, opto, ut et abscindantur et sint eunuchi illi amputatis testiculis et veretro, i. e., qui docere et gignere filios spirituales nequeunt, extra ecclesiam ejiciendi." On the other hand, in the Commentary of 1538, he says quite simply, "allusit . . . ad circumcisionem, q. d. cogunt vos circumcidi, utinam ipsi funditus et radicitus excindantur."

[11] Elsner, Wolf, Baumgarten.

[12] Ellicott.

[13] Comp. Acts xvii. 6, xxi. 38.

[14] Sturz, *dial. Mac.* p. 146.

[15] Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 7; Eph. ii. 10; Soph. *Oed. C.* 1459: τάξίωμ' ἐφ' ᾧ καλεῖς.

Ver. 14.[5] Reason assigned for the διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης κ.τ.λ. just said: *for the whole law is fulfilled in one utterance;* that is, compliance with the whole Mosaic law has taken place and exists, if one single commandment of it is complied with, namely, the commandment, "*Love thy neighbor as thyself.*" If, therefore, ye through love serve one another, the whole point in dispute is thereby solved; there can no longer be any discussion whether ye are bound to fulfil this or that precept of the law,— ye have fulfilled the whole law. "Theologia brevissima et longissima; brevissima quod ad verba et sententias attinet, sed usu et re ipsa latior, longior, profundior et sublimior toto mundo," "Theology the briefest and the longest; the briefest, as to words and sentences, but in experience and fact wider, longer, deeper and higher than the whole world," Luther. ὁ πᾶς νόμος[6] places the *totality* of the law in contradistinction to its *single utterance.* The view of Hofmann, that "it denotes the *law collectively as an unity, the fulfilment* of which *existing in the readers* they have *in the love* which they are to show," falls to the ground with the erroneous reading, to which it is with arbitrary artifice adapted; as in particular, ὁ πᾶς νόμος means not at all the *law as unity,* but *the whole law.*[7] In point of fact, the phrase does not differ from ὅλος ὁ νόμος, Matt. xxii. 40. Without alteration in the sense, the apostle might also have written πᾶς γὰρ ὁ νόμος, which would only have made the emphasis fall still more strongly on πᾶς. — πεπλήρωται] As to the reading, see the critical notes. The *perfect* denotes the fulfilment as complete and ready to hand, as in Rom. xiii. 8. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Estius, Baumgarten, Semler, Morus, Rückert, Matthies, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Wieseler, and others, have correctly explained πληροῦσθαι of *compliance* with the law; for the explanation *comprehenditur*, "is comprised,"[1] that is, ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται (which, however, in Rom. xiii. 9 is *distinguished* from πληροῦσθαι), is at variance with the universal usage of πληροῦν τὸν νόμον in the N. T.[2] The thought is the same as in Rom. xiii. 8, ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον νόμον πεπλήρωκε, and xiii. 10, πλήρωμα νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη. Grotius interprets πληρ. in the same way as in Matt. v. 17: "sicuti rudimenta implentur per doctrinam perfectiorem, "as rudiments are filled out by the more perfect doctrine." This interpretation is incorrect on account of πᾶς, and because a commandment *of the Mosaic law itself* is adduced. — ἐν τῷ] that is, in the saying of the law; see Winer, p. 103. — ἀγαπήσεις] Lev. xix. 18. Respecting the imperative *future*, see on Matt. i. 21; and as to ἑαυτόν used of the *second person*, see on Rom. xiii. 9.[3] On the *idea* of the ὡς ἑαυτ., see on Matt. xxii. 39.[4] The *neighbor* is, for the *Christian* who justly (Matt. v. 17) applies to himself this Mosaic commandment, his *fellow-Christian*,[5] just as for the Jew it is his fellow-Jew. But how little this is to be taken as *excluding* any other at all, is shown not only by distinct intimations, such as vi. 10, 1 Thess. iii. 12, 2 Pet. i. 7, but also by the whole spirit of Christianity, which, as to this point, finds its most beautiful expression in the example of the Samaritan (Luke x.); and Paul himself was a Samaritan of this kind towards Jews and Gentiles. — The question, how Paul could with justice say of the *whole* law that it was fulfilled by love toward one's neighbor, is not to be answered, either by making νόμος signify the *Christian* law,[6] or by understanding it only of the *moral law*,[7] or of the *second* table of the Decalogue,[8] or of every divinely *revealed law in general;*[9] for, according to the connection of the whole epistle, ὁ πᾶς νόμος cannot mean anything else than the *whole Mosaic law*. But it is to be answered by placing ourselves at the lofty spiritual standpoint of the apostle, from which he regarded all other commandments of the law as so thoroughly subordinate to the commandment of love, that whosoever has fulfilled *this* commandment stands in the moral scale and the moral estimation just as if he had fulfilled the *whole* law. From this lofty and bold standpoint everything, which was not connected with the commandment of love (Rom. xiii. 8–10) fell so completely into the background,[10] that it was no longer considered as aught to be separately and independently fulfilled ; on the contrary, the *whole* law appeared already accomplished in *love*, that is, in the state of feeling and action produced by the Spirit of God (ver. 22 f. ; Rom. xv. 30), in which is contained the culminating point, goal, and consummation of all parts of the law.[1] The idea thus amounts to an *impletio totius legis dilectione formata*, "fulfilment of the whole law, energized by love," by which the claim of the law is satisfied (ver. 23). The view of Hofmann, that here the law comes into consideration only *so far as* it is not already *fulfilled* in faith ; that for the *believer* its requirement consists in *the commandment of love*, and even the realization of this is already *existing in him*, so that he has only to *show* the love wrought in him by God—simply emanates from the erroneous form of the text and the wrong interpretation of ver. 14 adopted by him. That the apostle, moreover, while adducing *only* the commandment of *love toward one's neighbor*, does not exclude the commandment of *love towards God*,[2] was obvious of itself to the Christian consciousness from the necessary connection between the love of God and the love of our neighbor.[3] Paul was induced by the scope of the context to bring forward the latter only (vv. 13, 15).

---

[1] Comp. Matt. xxvi. 5; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* 338.

[2] See Heindorf, *ad Plat. Prot.* p. 315 B; Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 153; Klotz *ad Devar.* p. 669; Winer, p. 554 f.

[3] Comp. Rom. vii. 8.

[4] Comp. Rom. vi. 18, 22; 1 Cor. ix. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 19.

[5] Hofmann reads the verse: ὁ γ. πᾶς νόμος ἐν ὑμῖν πεπλήρωται· ἀγαπήσεις κ.τ.λ. A form of the text so destitute of attestation (Tertullian alone has *in vobis instead of* ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ), that it is simply equivalent to a (very strange) *conjecture.* Also the omission of ἐν τῷ is much too feebly attested. In the text, followed above, A B C ℵ agree.

[6] Comp. 1 Tim. i. 16; Acts xix. 7, xx. 18; Soph. *El.* 1244; *Phil.* 13; Thuc. ii. 7. 2, viii. 93. 3; Krüger, § 50. 11. 12.

[7] [This is an approximate rendering of the passage, the meaning of which is not, to me at least, very clear. Hofmann seems to have been conscious of this want of clearness, for in his revised edition just issued he has considerably altered his mode of expression, but still leaves the matter somewhat obscure.—W. P. D.] Comp. also 2 Macc. vi. 5; 3 Macc. vi. 2 *et al.;* Herod. i. 111.

---

[1] Erasmus, Castalio, Luther, Calvin, Rambach, Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Winer, Usteri, Olshausen, Reiche, and others.

[2] Comp. ἐκπιμπλάναι τ. νόμον, Herod. i. 199; so also Philo, *de Abrah.* I. p. 36. See vi. 2; Matt. iii. 15; Rom. viii. 4, xiii. 8; Col. iv. 17.

[3] Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* IX. p. 447.

[4] Comp. Cic *de Legg.* i. 12: "Nihilo sese plus quam alterum homo diligat," "Let a man love himself no more than he does another."

[5] Comp. ver. 13, ἀλλήλοις, and see ver. 14.

[6] Koppe.

[7] Estius and many others.

[8] Beza and others; also Wieseler; comp. Ewald.

[9] Schott.

[10] Especially the precepts as to *cultus*, in the apostle's view, were included among the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, iv. 3.

Ver. 15. Δάκνετε καὶ κατεσθίετε] A climactic figurative designation of the *hateful working of party enmity*, in which they endeavored mutually to *hurt* and *destroy* one another. Figurative expressions of this nature, derived from ravenous wild beasts, are elsewhere in use.[4] κατεσθίειν is not, however, to be understood[5] as *to gnaw*, but must retain the meaning which it always has, *to eat up, to devour.*[6] Observe the *climax* of the three verbs, to which the *passive* turn of the final result to be dreaded also contributes : μὴ ὑπὸ ἀλλήλων ἀναλωθῆτε] *lest ye be consumed one of another—consumamini ;* that is (for Paul keeps by his figure), lest through these mutual party hostilities your life of Christian fellowship be utterly ruined and destroyed. What is meant is not the ceasing of their status as *Christians*,[7] in other words, their apostasy ; but, by means of such hostile behavior in the very bosom of the churches, there is at length an utter end to what constitutes the Christian *community*, the organic life of which is mutually destroyed by its own members.

Ver. 16. With the words "*But I mean*" (iii. 17, iv. 1) the apostle introduces, not something new, but a deeper and more comprehensive exhibition and discussion of that which, in vv. 13–15, he had brought home to his readers by way of admonition and of warning—down to ver. 26. Hofmann is wrong in restricting the illustration merely to what follows after ἀλλά, —a view which is in itself arbitrary, and is opposed to the manifest correlation existing between the contrast of flesh and spirit and the *ἀφορμή*, which the free Christian is not to afford to the flesh (ver. 13). — *πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε*] *dative* of the *norma.*[1] The subsequent *πνεύματι ἄγεσθε* in ver. 18 is more favorable to this view than to that of Fritzsche,[2] who makes it the dative *commodi* (*spiritui divino vitam consecrare*, "to consecrate the life to the Divine Spirit," or to that of Wieseler, who makes it *instrumental*, so that the Spirit is conceived as *path* (the idea is different in the case of *διά* in 2 Cor. v. 7), or of Hofmann, who renders : "*by virtue* of the Spirit." Calovius well remarks : "*juxta* instinctum et impulsum," "according to the suggestion and impulse of the Spirit." The *spirit* is not, however, the *moral nature of man* (that is, *ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος*, *ὁ νοῦς*, Rom. vii. 22, 23), which is sanctified by the Divine Spirit,[3] in behalf of which appeal is erroneously (see also Rom. viii. 9) made to the contrast of *σάρξ*, since the *divine πνεῦμα* is in fact the power which overcomes the *σάρξ* ;[4] but it is *the Holy Spirit.* This Spirit is given to believers as the divine principle of the Christian life (iii. 2, 5, iv. 6), and they are to obey it, and not the ungodly desires of their *σάρξ*.[5] The absence of the article is not[6] at variance with this view, but it is not to be explained in a *qualitative* sense,[7] any more than in the case of *θεός*, *κύριος*, and the like ; on the contrary, *πνεῦμα* has the nature of a *proper noun*, and, even when dwelling and ruling in the human spirit, remains always *objective*, as *the Divine Spirit*, specifically different from the *human* (Rom. viii. 16).[8] — *καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε*] is taken as *consequence* by the Vulgate, Jerome, Theodoret, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Estius, Bengel, and most expositors, including Winer, Paulus, Rückert, Matthies, Schott, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr ; but by others, as Castalio, Beza, Koppe, Usteri, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, in the sense of the *imperative.* Either view is well adapted to the context, since afterwards, for the illustration of what is said in ver. 16, the relation between *σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα* is set forth. But the view which takes it as *consequence* is the only one which corresponds with the usage in other passages of the N.T., in which *οὐ μή* with the aorist subjunctive is always used in the sense of confident *assurance*, and not *imperatively*, like *οὐ* with the *future*, although in classical authors *οὐ μή* is so employed. "*Ye will certainly not fulfil the lust of the flesh*,—this is the moral blessed consequence, which is *promised* to them, if they walk according to the Spirit."[9] [See Note LXXI., p. 244.]

---

[1] Therein lies the essence of the so-called *tertius usus*, "third use," of the law, the further development of which is given in the Epistle to the Romans. Comp. Sieffert, in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* p. 271 f. [See Chapter on "The Third Use." *Formula of Concord*, chap. vi., Philadelphia edition, *Book of Concord*, I. 508 sqq., 595 sqq.]

[2] Comp. Matt. xxii. 37 f.

[3] Comp. 1 John iv. 20 ; 1 Cor. viii. 1, 3.

[4] See Maji *Obss.* II. p. 86 ; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VIII. p. 230 ; Wetstein, *in loc.*

[5] With Schott.

[6] See on 2 Cor. xi. 20 ; Hom. *Il.* ii. 314, xxi. 24, *Od.* i. 8, *et al.;* LXX. Gen. xl. 17 ; Isa. i. 7 ; Add. ad Esth. i. 11.

[7] Hofmann.

Ver. 17. *Ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τ. σάρκος*] The foregoing exhortation, with its promise, is elucidated by the remark

---

[1] *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, Rom. viii. 4. Comp. vi. 16 ; Phil. iii. 16 ; Rom. iv. 12 ; Hom. *Il.* xv. 194 : *οὔτι Διὸς βέομαι φρέσιν*, "Nor do I order my life according to the will of Zeus."

[2] *Ad Rom.* I. p. 225.

[3] Beza, Gomarus, Rückert, de Wette, and others ; comp. Michaelis, Morus, Flatt, Schott, Olshausen, Windischmann, Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 389.

[4] Rom. vii. 23 ff., Rom. viii. 1 ff.

[5] Comp. Neander, and Müller, *v. d. Sünde*, I. p. 453, ed. 5.

[6] In opposition to Harless on *Eph.* p. 268.

[7] Hofmann.

[8] Comp. on vv. 3, 5, and on Rom. viii. 4 ; also Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 78.

[9] On *τελεῖν*, used of the actual carrying out of a desire, passion, or the like, comp. Soph. *O. R.* 1330, *El.* 769 ; Hesiod, *Scut.* 36.

that the flesh and the Spirit are contrary to one another in their desires, so that the two cannot together influence the conduct. — As here also τὸ πνεῦμα is not the *moral nature of man* (see on ver. 16), but *the Holy Spirit*,[1] a comparison has to some extent incorrectly been made with the variance between the νοῦς and the σάρξ (Rom. vii. 18 ff.) in the still unregenerate man, in whom the moral will is subject to the flesh, along with its parallels in Greek and Roman authors.[2] *Here* the subject spoken of is the conflict between the fleshly and the *divine* principle in the *regenerate*. The relation is therefore different, although the conflict in itself has some similarity. Bengel in the comparison cautiously adds, "*quodammodo*," "in a measure." — ταῦτα γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται] As to the reading γάρ, see the critical notes. It introduces *a pertinent further illustration* of what has just been said. In order to obviate an alleged tautology, Rückert and Schott have placed ταῦτα γ. ἀλλ. ἀντίκ. in a parenthesis (see also Grotius), and taken it in the sense : "for they are *in their nature* opposed to one another." A gratuitous insertion ; in that case Paul must have written : φύσει γὰρ ταῦτα ἀλλ. ἀντίκ., for the bare ἀντίκειται after what precedes can only be understood as referring to the actually existing conflict. — ἵνα μὴ κ.τ.λ.] is not[3] to be joined to the first half of the verse,—a connection which is forbidden by the right view of the ταῦτα γὰρ ἀλλ. ἀντίκ. as not parenthetical—but to the latter. ἵνα expresses the *purpose*, and that not the purpose *of God* in the conflict mentioned—which, when the will is directed towards that which is good, would amount to an ungodly (immoral) purpose—but the purpose of those *powers contending* with one another in this conflict, in their mutual relation to the moral attitude of man's will, which even in the regenerate may receive a twofold determination.[4] In this conflict both have the purpose that the man should not do *that very thing* (ταῦτα with emphasis) which in the respective cases (ἂν) he *would*. *If he would do what is good, the flesh*, striving against the Spirit, is *opposed to this ; if he would do what is evil, the Spirit*, striving against the flesh, is *opposed to that*. All the *one-sided* explanations of ἃ ἂν θέλητε, whether the words be referred to the *moral* will which is hindered by the flesh,[5] or to the *sensual* will, which is hindered by the

---

[1] De Wette wrongly makes the objection, that in the state of the regenerate this relation of conflict does not find a place, seeing that the Spirit has the preponderance (vv. 18, 24). Certainly so, if the regeneration were complete, and not such as it was in the case of the Galatians (iv. 19), and if the *concupiscentia carnis*, "lust of the flesh," did not remain at all in the regenerate. That πνεῦμα here denotes the *Holy* Spirit, is confirmed by ver. 22. The difference of the conflict in the unconverted and in the regenerate consists in this,—that in the case of the former the σάρξ strives with the better moral will (νοῦς), and the σάρξ is victorious (Rom. vii. 7 ff.) ; but in the case of the regenerate, the σάρξ strives with the Holy Spirit, and man may obey the latter (ver. 18). In the former case, the creaturely power of the σάρξ is in conflict with the likewise creaturely νοῦς, but in the latter with the divine uncreated πνεῦμα. De Wette was erroneously of opinion that here Paul says briefly and indistinctly what in Rom. vii. 15 ff. he sets forth clearly; the view of Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 389, is similar.

[2] Xen. *Cyr.* vi. 1. 21 ; Arrian. *Epict.* ii. 26 ; Porphyr. *de abst.* i. 56 ; Cic. *Tusc.* ii. 21, *et al.*, and Rabbins (see Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 1178 ff).

[3] With Grotius, Semler, Moldenhauer, Rückert, and Schott.

[4] Comp. Weiss. *bibl. Theol.* p. 361 f.

[5] Luther, Erasmus, Calvin, Estius, Morus, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Usteri, Rückert, Schott, de Wette ; also Baumgarten-Crusius, Holsten, and others.

Spirit,[1] are set aside by the fact that *ἵνα μή κ.τ.λ.* is connected with the preceding *ταῦτα γὰρ ἀλλ. ἀντίκ.*, and this comprehends the mutual conflict of *two* powers.[2] Winer has what is, on the whole, the correct interpretation : "*τὸ πνεῦμα* impedit vos (rather *impedire vos cupit*), quo minus perficiatis *τὰ τῆς σαρκός* (ea, quae *ἡ σὰρξ* perficere cupit), contra *ἡ σὰρξ* adversatur vobis, ubi *τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος* peragere studetis," "*The Spirit hinders* (rather *desires to hinder*) *you from accomplishing the things of the flesh* (i.e., *those which the flesh desires to accomplish*) ; *on the other hand, the flesh antagonizes you when you are eager to do the things of the Spirit.*"[3] This more precise statement of the conflict (*ταῦτα . . . ταῦτα ποιῆτε*) might indeed in itself be dispensed with, since it was in substance already contained in the first half of the verse ; but it bears the stamp of an emphatic and indeed solemn exposition, that it might be more carefully considered and laid to heart. In Hofmann's view, *ἵνα μὴ κ.τ.λ.* is intended to express, as the aim of the conflict, that the action of the Christian is not to be *self-willed* ("springing from himself in virtue of his own self-determination") ; and this, because he cannot *attain to rest* otherwise than by allowing his conduct to be determined by the Spirit. But setting aside the fact that the latter idea is not to be found in the text, the conception of, and emphasis upon, the *self-willed*, which with the whole stress laid on the being *self*-determined would form the point of the thought, are arbitrarily introduced, just as if Paul had written : *ἵνα μὴ ἃ ἂν αὐτοὶ* (or *αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς*, Rom. vii. 25, or *αὐθαίρετοι*, or *αὐτογνώμονες, αὐτόνομοι, αὐτόβουλοι*, or the like).

Ver. 18. If, however, of these two conflicting powers, *the Spirit* is that which rules you, in what blessed freedom ye are then![4]—*πνεύματι ἄγεσθε*] See on Rom. viii. 14.[5]—*οὐκ ἐστὲ ὑπὸ νόμον*] namely, *because then the law can have no power over you ;* through the ruling power of the Spirit ye find yourselves in such a condition of moral life (in such a *καινότης ζωῆς*, Rom. vi. 4, and *πνεύματος*, vii. 6), that the law has no power to censure, to condemn, or to punish anything in you.[6] In accordance with ver. 23, this explanation is the only correct one ; and *this* freedom is the true *moral* freedom from the law, to which the apostle here, in accordance with ver. 13, attaches importance.[7] There is less accuracy in the usual interpretation:[8] ye no longer *need* the law ; as Chrysostom : *τίς χρεία νόμου; τῷ γὰρ οἴκοθεν κατορθοῦντι τὰ μείζω ποῦ χρεία παιδαγωγοῦ* ; or : you are free from the *outward constraint* of the law ;[9] comp. also Hofmann, who, in connection with his mistaken interpretation of ver. 14, understands a *subjection to the law* as a requirement coming *from without*, which does not exist in the case of the

---

[1] Chrysostom, Theodoret, Beza, Grotius, Neander. Comp. also Ewald, "in order *that ye*, according to the divine will expressed on the point, *may not do that which ye possibly might wish*, but that of which ye may know that God desires and approves it."

[2] Comp. Ernesti *Urspr. der Sünde*, I. p. 89.

[3] So in substance Ambrose, Oecumenius, Bengel, Zachariae, Koppe, Matthies, Reithmayr, and others ; Wieseler most accurately.

[4] Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 17 ; Rom. viii. 2 ff.

[5] Comp. also 2 Tim. iii. 6.

[6] Comp. on Rom. viii. 4.

[7] Comp. 1 Tim. i. 9.

[8] Adopted by Winer, Rückert, Matthies, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius ; comp. de Wette.

[9] Usteri, Ewald.

Christian, because *in him* the law collectively as an unity is fulfilled. [See Note LXXII., p. 244 seq.]

Vv. 19–23. The assertion just made by Paul, that the readers as led by the Spirit would not be under the law, he now illustrates more particularly (*δέ*), by setting forth the entirely opposite moral states, which are produced by the flesh and by the Spirit respectively (vv. 22 f.) : the former exclude from the Messiah's kingdom (are therefore abandoned to the curse of the law), while against the latter there is no law.

Ver. 19. *Φανερὰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.*] *Manifest, however* (now to explain myself more precisely as to this *οὐκ ἐστὲ ὑπὸ νόμον*), open to the eyes of all, evidently recognizable as such by every one, *are the works of the flesh*, that is, those concrete actual phenomena which are produced when the flesh, the sinful nature of man (and not the Holy Spirit), is the active principle. The *δέ* (in opposition to Hofmann's objection) is the *δέ explicativum*, frequently used by Greek authors and in the N.T.[1] That one who is led by the Spirit will *abstain from* the *ἔργα* which follow, is obvious of itself ; but Paul does not state this, and therefore does not by *δέ* make the transition to it, as Hofmann thinks, who gratuitously defines the sense of *φανερά* as : "well known to the Christian *without law*."[2] The list which follows of the *ἔργα τῆς σαρκός* contains *four* approximate divisions : (1) *lust : πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσ., ἀσέλγ.* ; (2) *idolatry* : *εἰδωλολατρ., φαρμακ.* ; (3) *enmity : ἔχθραι . . . φόνοι* ; (4) *intemperance : μέθαι, κῶμοι.* — *ἀκαθαρσία*] *lustful impurity* (lewdness) *generally*, after the special *πορνεία*. Comp. Rom. i. 24 ; 2 Cor. xii. 21. — *ἀσέλγεια*] *lustful immodesty and wantonness.* See on Rom. xiii. 13. Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 21 ; Eph. iv. 19 ; 1 Pet. iv. 3 ; 2 Pet. ii. 7. [See Note LXXIII., p. 245.]

Ver. 20. *Εἰδωλολατρεία*] is not to be considered as a species of the *sins of lust* ;[3] a view against which may be urged the literal sense of the word, and also the circumstance that unchastity was only practised in the case of *some* of the heathen rites. It is to be taken in its *proper* sense as *idolatry.* Living among Gentiles, Gentile Christians were not unfrequently seduced to idolatry, to which the sacrificial feasts readily gave occasion.[4] — *φαρμακεία*] may *here* mean either *poison-mingling*,[5] or *sorcery.*[6] The latter interpretation is to be preferred,[7] partly on account of the combination with *εἰδωλολατρεία*,[8] partly because *φόνοι* occurs subsequently. Sorcery was very prevalent, especially in Asia (Acts xix. 19). To understand it, with Olshausen, specially of *love-incantations*, is arbitrary and groundless, since the series of sins of lust is closed with *ἀσέλγεια.* — The particulars which follow as far as *φόνοι* stand related as special manifestations to the more general *ἔχθραι*. On the *plural*, comp. Herod. vii. 145 ; Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 10. — *ζῆλος*, Rom. xiii. 13 ; *jealousy*, 1 Cor. iii. 3, 2 Cor. xii. 20, Jas. iii. 16. — The distinction between θυμός and ὀργή is, that ὀργή denotes the *wrath in itself*, and θυμός the *effervescence* of it, *exasperation*. Hence in Rev. xvi. 19, xix. 15, we have θυμὸς τῆς ὀργῆς.[1] — ἐριθεῖαι] self-seeking *party-cabals*.[2] — διχοστασία, αἱρέσεις] *divisions, factions*.[3] Observe how Paul, having the circumstances of the Galatians in view, has *multiplied* especially the designations of *dispeace*.[4] According to 1 Cor. iii. 3 also, these phenomena are works of the *flesh*.

---

[1] Winer, p. 421 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 1. 1.

[2] On *φανερός*, *lying open to cognition, manifestus*, see van Hengel, *ad Rom.* I. p. 111.

[3] Olshausen.

[4] Comp. on 1 Cor. v. 11.

[5] Plat. *Legg.* viii. p 845 E ; Polyb. vi. 13. 4, xl. 3. 7 ; comp. *φαρμακός*, Dem. 794. 4.

[6] Ex. vii. 11, 22, viii. 3 ; Isa. xlvii. 9, 12 ; Rev. ix. 21, xviii. 23, xxi. 8 ; Wisd. xii. 4, xviii. 13 ; comp. *φάρμακα*, Herod. iii. 85 ; *φαρμακεύειν*, Herod. vii. 114.

[7] With Luther, Grotius, Estius, Koppe, Winer, Usteri, Schott, de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, and others.

[8] Comp. Deut. xviii. 10 ff. ; Ex. xxii. 18.

Ver. 21. Φθόνοι, φόνοι] paronomasia, as in Rom. i. 29 ; Eur. *Troad.* 736. — κῶμοι] *revellings, comissationes*, especially at night.[5] — καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις] *and the things which are similar to these* (the whole matters mentioned in vv. 20, 21). "Addit *et iis* similia, quia quis omnem lernam carnalis vitae recenseat ?" "He adds 'such-like ;' for who can recount the entire marsh of this carnal life." Luther, 1519. — The προ in προλέγω and προεῖπον is the *beforehand* in reference to the *future realization*[6] at the παρουσία ; and the *past* προεῖπον reminds the readers of the instructions and warnings orally given to them, the tenor of which justifies us in thinking that he is referring to the first *and* second sojourn in Galatia. — πράσσοντες] those who *practise* such things ; but in ver. 17 ποιῆτε : *ye do*.[7] — βασιλείαν Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομ.][8] Sins of this kind, therefore, exclude the Christian from the kingdom of the Messiah, and cause him to incur condemnation, unless by μετάνοια he again enters into the life of faith, and so by renewed faith appropriates forgiveness.[9] For the having been reconciled by faith is the preliminary condition of the new, holy life,[10] and therefore does not cancel responsibility in the judgment.[11]

Ver. 22. ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος] essentially the same idea, as would be expressed by τὰ δὲ ἔργα τοῦ πνεύματος—the moral result which the Holy Spirit brings about as its fruit.[12] But Paul is fond of *variety* of expression.[13] A *special intention*[14] in the choice cannot be made good, since both ἔργα and καρπός[15] are in themselves *voces mediae*, "colorless terms,"[1] and according to the context, nothing at all hinged on the indication of organic development,[2]—a meaning which, moreover, would have been conveyed even by *ἔργα*, and without a figure,—or of the proceeding from an inner impulse.[3] The *collective*[4] *singular* *καρπός* has sprung, as in Eph. v. 9, from the idea of internal unity and moral homogeneity; for which, however, the *singular* *ἔργον* (see on vi. 4) would also have been suitable (in opposition to the view of Wieseler).—That *φῶς* and *πνεῦμα* are not to be considered as identical on account of Eph. v. 9, see on Eph. *l.c.* — *ἀγάπη*] as the main element,[5] and at the same time the practical principle of the rest, is placed at the head, corresponding to the contrast in ver. 13. The selection of these virtues, and the order in which they are placed, are such as necessarily to unfold and to present to the readers the specific character of the *life* of Christian *fellowship* (which had been so sadly disturbed among the Galatians, ver. 15). Love itself, because it is a *fruit* of the Spirit, is called in Rom. xv. 30, *ἀγάπη τοῦ πνεύματος*. — *χαρά*] is the holy joy of the soul, which is produced by the Spirit,[6] through whom we carry in our hearts the consciousness of the divine love,[7] and thereby the certainty of blessedness, the triumph over all sufferings, etc. The interpretations: *participation in the joy of others*,[8] and *a cheerful nature towards others*,[9] introduce ideas which are not in the text.[10] — *εἰρήνη*] *Peace* with others. Rom. xiv. 17; Eph. iv. 3. The word has been understood to mean also peace *with God*,[11] *and peace with oneself*;[12] but against this interpretation it may be urged, that *this* peace (the peace of reconciliation) is *antecedent* to the further fruits of the Spirit, and that *εἰρήνη κ.τ.λ.* is evidently correlative with *ἔχθρα κ.τ.λ.* in ver. 20, so that the *εἰρήνη Θεοῦ* (see on Phil. iv. 7) does not belong to this connection. — *μακροθυμία*] *long-suffering*, by which, withholding the assertion of our own rights, we are patient under injuries,[13] in order to bring him who injures us to reflection and amendment.[14] The opposite: *ὀξυθυμία*, Eur. *Andr.* 728. — *χρηστότης*] *Benignity.* 2 Cor. vi. 6; Col. iii. 12.[15] — *ἀγαθωσύνη*] *goodness*, probity of disposition and of action. It thus admirably suits the *πίστις* which follows. Usually interpreted:[16] *kindness*; but see on Rom. xv. 14. — *πίστις*] *fidelity.*[17] Matt. xxiii. 23; Rom. iii. 3; and see on Philem. 5. — *πραΰτης*: *meekness.*[18] The opposite: *ἀγριότης*, Plat. *Conv.* p. 197 D, in Greek authors

---

[1] See on Rom. ii. 8.

[2] See on Rom. ii. 8 ; 2 Cor. xii. 20.

[3] Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 18 f. On αἵρεσις in this signification, which occurs only in later writers (1 Cor. xi. 19 ; Acts xxiv. 5, 14), see Wetstein, II. p. 147 f. Comp. αἱρετιστής, *partisan*, Polyb. i. 79. 9, ii. 38. 7.

[4] Comp. Soph. *O. C.* 1234 f.

[5] Herm. *Privatalterth.* § 17. 29. Comp. Rom. xiii. 13 ; 1 Pet. iv. 3 ; Plat. *Theaet.* p. 173 D : δεῖπνα καὶ σὺν αὐλητρίσι κῶμοι, "banquets and revellings with flute-girls." *Symp.* p. 212 C ; Isaeus, p. 39. 21 : κῶμοι καὶ ἀσέλγεια, "revellings and licentiousness." Herod. i. 21 : πίνειν κ. κώμῳ χρέεσθαι ἐς ἀλλήλους, "to drink and indulge in revelling with one another." Jacobs, *Del. epigr.* iv. 43 : κώμου κ. πάσης κοίρανε παννυχίδος, "lead the revel and the entire night festival."

[6] Herod. i. 53, vii. 116 ; Lucian. *Jov. Trag.* 30 ; Polyb. vi. 3. 2.

[7] See on Rom. i. 32 ; John iii. 20.

[8] Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 9 f , xv. 50 ; Eph. v. 5 ; Jas. ii. 5 ; and generally, Rom. vi. 8 ff.

[9] 2 Cor. vii. 9, 10 ; Rom. viii. 34 ; 1 John ii. 1 f. ; observe the *present* participle.

[10] Rom. vi.

[11] 2 Cor. v. 10 ; Rom. xiv. 10.

[12] Comp. Pind. *Ol.* vii. 8 : καρπὸς φρενός, *Nem.* x. 12, *Pyth* ii. 74 ; Wisd. iii. 13, 15.

[13] Comp. Eph. ii. 9, 11.

[14] Chrysostom thought that Paul had used καρπός, because good works were not, like evil works, brought about by ourselves alone, but also by the divine φιλανθρωπία. Comp. also Holsten, who, however, makes the distinction sharper. Luther and many others, including Winer, Usteri, Schott : because it is *beneficent* and *praiseworthy* works which are spoken of. Matthies : because that whereby the Spirit proves His presence, is, in and by itself, directly fruit and enjoyment. Reithmayr mixes up various reasons, including the very groundless suggestion that in καρπός there is implied the acknowledgment of *man's joint part* in the production.

[15] Comp. the clear passage in the LXX.

Prov. x. 16, where ἔργα and καρποί alternate exactly in the opposite sense: ἔργα δικαίων ζωὴν ποιεῖ, καρποὶ δὲ ἀσεβῶν ἁμαρτίας.

[1] See on καρπός especially, Rom. vi. 21 f.; Matt vii. 20; Plat. *Ep.* 7, p. 336 B.

[2] To which Olshausen refers καρπός.

[3] de Wette.

[4] Hom. *Od.* i. 156, and frequently.

[5] 1 Cor. xiii.; Rom. xii. 9.

[6] See on Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Thess. i. 6; comp. also 2 Cor. vi. 10.

[7] Rom. v. 5.

[8] Grotius, Zachariae, Koppe, Borger, Winer, Usteri.

[9] Calvin, Michaelis.

[10] Rom. xii. 15.

[11] Rom. v. 1.

[12] de Wette and others.

[13] βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν, Jas. i. 19.

[14] Comp. Rom. ii. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 6.

[15] See Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 140 ff.

[16] Also by Ewald and Wieseler.

[17] de Wette, Wieseler, Reithmayr, take it as *confidence*, the opposite to distrust, 1 Cor. xiii. 7. But the *substantive* does not occur in this general sense in any other passage of the N. T.

[18] See on 1 Cor. iv. 21.

often combined with φιλανθρωπία. — ἐγκράτεια] *self-control*, that is, here *continence*, as opposed to sins of lust and intemperance.[1]

Ver. 23. Just as τὰ τοιαῦτα in ver. 21,[2] τῶν τοιούτων in this passage is also *neuter*, applying to the virtues previously mentioned among the fruits of the Spirit,[3] and not *masculine*, as it is understood by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Luther, Grotius, Bengel, and many of the older expositors; also by Koppe, Rosenmüller, Rückert, Hofmann.[4] It is, moreover, quite unsuitable to assume (with Beza, Estius, Rosenmüller, Flatt, and others) a μείωσις;[5] for Paul wishes only to illustrate the οὐκ εἶναι ὑπὸ νόμον, which he has said in ver. 18 respecting those who are led by the Spirit. This he does by first exhibiting, for the sake of the contrast, the works of the flesh, and expressing a judgment upon the doers of them; and then by exhibiting the fruit of the Spirit, and saying: "*against virtues and states of this kind there is no law.*" Saying this, however, is by no means "more than superfluous" (Hofmann), but is intended to make evident how it is that, *by virtue of this their moral frame*, those who are led by the Spirit are not subject to the Mosaic law.[6] For whosoever is so constituted that a law is not against him, over such a one the law has no power. Comp. 1 Tim. i. 9 f.

Ver. 24. After Paul has in ver. 17 explained his exhortation given in ver. 16, and recommended compliance with it on account of its blessed results (vv. 18–23), he now shows (continuing his discourse by the transitional δέ) how this compliance—the walking in the Spirit—has its ground and motive in the *specific nature of the Christian*; if *the Christian* has crucified his flesh, and consequently lives through the Spirit, his walk also must follow the Spirit. — τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν] not: they *crucify* their flesh;[7] but: *they have crucified it*, namely, when they became believers and received baptism, whereby they entered into moral fellowship with the death of Jesus[8] by becoming νεκροὶ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ.[9] The symbolical idea: "*to have crucified the flesh*," expresses, therefore, the having renounced all fellowship of life with sin, the seat of which is the flesh (σάρξ); so that, just as Christ has been objectively crucified, by means of entering into the fellowship of this death on the cross the Christian has *subjectively*—in the moral consciousness of faith—crucified the σάρξ, that is, has rendered it entirely void of life and efficacy, by means of faith as the new element of life to which he has been transferred. To the Christians *ideally* viewed, as here, this ethical crucifixion of the flesh is something *which has taken place*,[1] but *in reality* it is also something *now taking place* and *continuous*.[2] The latter circumstance, however, in this passage, where Paul looks upon the matter as completed at conversion and the life thenceforth led as ζῆν πνεύματι,[3] is not to be conceived[4] as standing *alongside of* that ideal relation,—an interpretation which the historical aorist unconditionally forbids. — σὺν τοῖς παθήμ. κ. ταῖς ἐπιθυμ] *together with the affections*[5] *and lusts*, which, brought about by the power of sin instigated by the prohibitions of the law,[6] have their seat in and take their rise from the σάρξ, the corporeo-psychical nature of man, which is antagonistic to God ; hence they must, if the σάρξ is crucified through fellowship with the death of the Lord, be necessarily crucified *with it*, and could not remain alive.[7] The ἐπιθυμίαι are the more special sinful lusts and desires, in which the παθήματα display their activity and take their definite shapes.[8] The affections excite the feelings, and hence arise ἐπιθυμίαι, in which their definite expressions manifest themselves.[9]

---

[1] Ecclus. xviii. 30; Acts xxiv. 25; 2 Pet. i. 6; Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 1: ἀφροδισίων κ. γαστρὸς ἐγκρατέστατος.

[2] *Haec talia:* see Engelhardt, *ad Plat. Lach.* p. 14; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 5. 2.

[3] Irenaeus, Jerome, Augustine, Pelagius, Calvin, Beza, yet doubtfully, Castalio, Cornelius à Lapide, and most expositors.

[4] So also Bäumlein, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1862, p. 551 f. The objection that the *singular* ὁ καρπός in ver. 22 forbids the *neuter* interpretation (Hofmann), is quite groundless both in itself and because καρπός is *collective.*

[5] *Non adversatur, sed commendat*, "He does not oppose, but commends," and the like; so also de Wette.

[6] The fundamental idea of the whole epistle—the freedom of the Christian from the Mosaic law—is thus fully displayed in its *moral* nature and truth. Comp. Sieffert, in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* 1869, p. 264.

[7] Luther and others; also Matthies.

[8] See on ii. 19, vi. 14; Rom. vi. 3, vii. 4.

[9] Rom. vi. 11.

Ver. 25. If the Christian has crucified his flesh, it is no longer the ruling power of his life, which, on the contrary, proceeds now from *the Holy Spirit*, the power opposed to the flesh ; and the obligation thence arising is, that the *conduct* also of the Christian should correspond to this principle of life (for otherwise what a self-contradiction would he exhibit !) — εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι] introduced asyndetically (without οὖν), so as to be more vivid. The emphasis is on πνεύματι, as the contrast to the σάρξ : If after the crucifying of the flesh we owe our life to *the Holy Spirit*, by which is meant the life which begins with conversion, through the παλιγγενεσία (Tit. iii. 5)—the life of the new creature, vi. 15.[10]—The *first* πνεύματι is *ablative:* the *second*, emphatically placed at the commencement of the apodosis, is the expression of the *norma* (ver. 16).[11] στοιχεῖν (comp. also Acts xxi. 24) is distinguished from περιπατεῖν in ver. 16 only as to the figure ; the latter is *ambulare*, the former is *ordine procedere* (to march). But both represent the same idea, the moral *conduct of life*, the *firm regulation* of which is symbolized in στοιχεῖν.

Ver. 26. *Special* exhortations now begin, flowing from the general obligation mentioned above (vv. 16, 25) ; first *negative* (ver. 26), and then *positive* (vi. 1 ff). Hence ver. 26 ought to begin a new chapter. The address, ἀδελφοί (vi. 1), and the transition to the second person, which Rückert, Schott, Wieseler, make use of to defend the division of the chapters, and the consideration added by de Wette, that the vices mentioned in ver. 26 belong to the works of the flesh in ver. 20, and to the dissension in ver. 15 (this would also admit of application to vi. 1 ff.), cannot outweigh the connection which binds the *special* exhortations together. — κενόδοξοι] *vanam*

---

[1] Comp. Rom. vi. 2 ff.

[2] Rom. viii. 13 ; Col. iii. 5.

[3] Ver. 25 ; comp. ii. 20.

[4] With Bengel and Schott.

[5] See on Rom. vii. 5.

[6] Rom. vii. 8.

[7] Comp. on ver. 17 ; Rom. vii. 14 ff.

[8] Rom. vii. 5, 8.

[9] τῇ γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸν θυμὸν ἰούσῃ δυνάμει δῆλον ὅτι τοῦτο ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα, "it is manifest that this term was applied to the force coming upon the Spirit (ἐπὶ τὸν θυμὸν)," Plat. *Crat.* p. 419 D. Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 5.

[10] Comp. Rom. vi. 4 ff., vii. 5 f., viii. 9 ; 2 Cor. iii. 6 ; Gal. ii. 20.

[11] Comp. vi. 16 ; Phil. iii. 16 ; Rom. iv. 12.

gloriam captantes.[1] In these warnings, Paul refers neither merely to those who had remained faithful to him,[2] nor merely to those of Judaistic sentiments,[3] for these partial references are not grounded on the context; but to the circumstances of the Galatians generally at that time, when boasting and strife (comp. ver. 15) were practised *on both sides.* —Both the γινώμεθα in itself,[4] and the use of the first person, imply a forbearing *mildness* of expression. — ἀλλήλους προκαλ., ἀλλήλοις φθονοῦντες] contains the *modus* of the κενοδοξία: *challenging one another* (to the conflict, in order to triumph over the challenged), *envying one another* (namely, those superior, with whom they do not venture to stand a contest).[5] — φθονεῖν governs only the *dative* of the person,[6] or the accusative *with the infinitive,*[7] not the mere accusative;[8] hence the reading adopted by Lachmann, ἀλλήλους φθον.,[9] must be considered as an error of transcription, caused by the mechanical repetition of the foregoing ἀλλήλους. — The fact that ἀλλήλ. in both cases precedes the verb, makes the *contrariety to fellowship* more apparent, ver. 13.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

LXVIII. Ver. 5. ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης.

The restriction of the argument by Meyer to justification seems too narrow. The subject at this particular place is rather, as Sieffert remarks: What is the goal towards which the true Christian advances from the time of the reception of grace? In opposition to the painful and fruitless endeavor to fulfil the law, this is, according to ver. 5, the joyful hope founded upon faith and grace. Weiss' paraphrase is: "We expect the salvation which we have to hope for in consequence of the righteousness which has been presented us ἐκ πίστεως" (Eng. Trans. I. 451).

LXIX. Ver. 11. εἰ περιτομὴν κ.τ.λ.

This interpretation, to which Sieffert objects, on the ground that while consistent with the line of argument, it nevertheless is incomprehensible how such slander could have originated, has been well put by Lightfoot: "At this point the malicious charge of his enemies rises up before the apostle: 'Why, you do the same thing yourself; you caused Timothy to be circumcised.' To this he replies: 'What, do *I*, who have incurred the deadly hatred of the Judaizers, who am exposed to continual persecution from them, do *I* preach circumcision?'" For other circumstances than the circumcision of Timothy, whence this charge might have originated, see Weiss' *Bibl. Theol. of N. T.*, Eng. Tr., I. 486.

---

[1] Phil. ii. 3; Polyb. xxvii. 6. 12, xxxix. 1. 1. Comp. κενοδοξεῖν, 4 Macc. v. 9, and κενοδοξία, Lucian *V. H.* 4, *M. D.* 8. See Servius, *ad Virg. Aen.* xi. 854.

[2] Olshausen.

[3] Theophylact and many others.

[4] *Fiamus,* "let us become." The matter is conceived as already in course of taking place; hence the *present,* and not the *aorist,* as is read in G*, min., γενώμεθα. The Vulgate and Erasmus also correctly render it *efficiamur.* On the other hand, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, and most expositors, incorrectly give *simus,* "let us be." Against *efficiamur* Beza brings forward the irrelevant dogmatic objection: "*atqui natura ipsa tales nos genuit,*" "But our very nature has begotten us as such," which does not hold good, because Christians are *regenerate* (ver. 24). Hofmann dogmatically affirms that forbearing mildness is out of the question. It is, in fact, implied in the very expression. Comp. Rom. xii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 14; Eph. v. 17. And passages such as iv. 12 are in no way opposed to this view, for they are *without negation;* comp. Eph. v. 1, Phil. iii. 17.

[5] On προκαλεῖσθαι, *to provoke,* see Hom. *Il.* iii. 432, vii. 50. 218. 285; *Od.* viii. 142; Polyb. i. 46. 11; Bast. *ep. crit.* p. 56, and the passages in Wetstein.

[6] Kühner, II. p. 247.

[7] Hom. *Od.* i. 346, xviii. 16, xi. 381; Herod. viii. 109.

[8] Not even in Soph. *O. R.* 310.

[9] Following B G*, and several min., Chrysostom, Theodoret, ms., Oecumenius.

LXX. Ver. 12. *αποκόψονται.*

"The common interpretation of the Fathers, confirmed by the use of the language in the LXX., is not to be rejected only because it is displeasing to the delicacy of modern times" (Jowett). The American section of the Revision committee, following the French rendering of Deut. xxiii. 1, recommends the euphemism, "Go beyond circumsion" as the preferable mode of expressing this idea of the verb in a version for general circulation. Both Lightfoot and Eadie emphasize the fact that such mutilation was a part of the rites of the worship of Cybele, and as such the allusion would have been at once understood. The idea conveyed is that circumcision, when no longer fulfilling its original design as an ordinance adumbrative of Christ and His blessings, has no more validity than such degrading prescriptions of the heathen, and that the sole difference is in degree, but not in kind. The application of this principle here is in the vein of intense irony. The explanation of Sanday is certainly remarkable, that while the interpretation here maintained is the true one, Paul is writing under the strain of passion, and in his anger uses an expression that indicates "one of very few flaws in a truly noble and generous character."

LXXI. Ver. 16. *επιθυμίαν σαρκὸς.*

"The Pauline conception of *σάρξ*, even where not used in ethical relations, is not contrary to its original anthropological signification, according to which it is the human body (not indeed with respect to the form, which is designated by *σῶμα*, but) with respect to its contents, and therefore especially with respect to its material substance, as well as according to its powers; and, therefore, in its inner combination with the lower human soul-life, which Paul ordinarily understands by the term *ψυχή*, as contradistinguished from the higher spiritual life of man allied to God, the *νοῦς*. This sensuo-psychical side of man's nature is clearly also *σάρξ* here, where *πνεῦμα* and *σάρξ* appear as two different principles working upon the human will from the higher human spiritual life, as also in Rom. vii., where *σάρξ* and *μέλη* are antithetical to *νοῦς*. But in this and other passages where *σάρξ* maintains an ethical relation, it especially signifies the sensuo-psychical side of man's nature, so far as it is brought by the human will which was originally in harmony with God into antagonism with God and all that is godly, and thus, by the egoistic alienation of that will from God, constituted a dominant life-principle, active through the first sin of Adam in the entire human race, and continually perpetuated through transmission" (Sieffert).

LXXII. Ver. 18. *οὐκ ἐστὲ ὑπὸ νόμον.*

While Sieffert's interpretation, as opposed to Meyer, that the Mosaic law is here referred to, cannot be substantiated, yet it is better, not merely with Usteri and Ewald, but with a large number of exegetes (Hofmann, Lightfoot, Eadie, among the more recent) and dogmaticians, to regard the not being under the law as freedom from the constraint and coercion of the law. So far as man is led by the Spirit of God, the law is written on his heart. No longer an external matter, it becomes a second nature, a life-force, whereby the duties prescribed by God are rendered with joy, instead of reluctance. Thus Weiss (*Bibl. Theol. of N. T.*, I. 483, Eng. Trans.): "Those who are led by the Spirit are, viz., no longer under the law (Gal. v. 18); for what the law with its requirement strove after, and yet could not reach (Rom. viii. 3), that the Spirit really attains to, inasmuch as at His instigation the requirement of the law is fulfilled in them who walk according to the Spirit. The power of the Spirit, which is operative in man, has taken the place of the law, which is outwardly fixed in the letter." Quenstedt (iv. 11): "Not to be under the law signifies to be freed from the curse and constraint of the law, because the regenerate are led by the Spirit, are delighted in the law according to the inner man, and spontaneously do the things which are of the law." Cf. *Formula of Concord* (598 : 16): "As long as man is not regenerate and conducts himself according to the law, and does the works of the law because they are thus commanded, from fear of punishment or desire for reward, he is still under the law, and his works are properly called by St. Paul works of the law, for they are extorted by the law, as those of slaves" (Phil. edition). Compare Westminster Confession, xix. 7.

LXXIII. Ver. 19. *ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς.*

"The flesh is spoken of in the entire short paragraph in its lusting and warrings, in contrast with the Spirit in its wrestlings and leadings. Those who are guided by the Spirit are not as such under the law; but the flesh is under law, under its sentence and dominion: manifest are its works, and the law cannot but condemn them as *ἔργα*, works done by the evil and unrenewed nature. It is needless to press a contrast in *φανερά* with the fruit of the Spirit, as being more hidden, and needing to be educed and specified. The works of the flesh are notorious and notoriously of a corrupt origin" (Eadie).

CHAPTER VI.

Ver. 2. ἀναπληρώσατε] [Elz., Tisch. 1859, following ℵ A C D, etc.] Lachm. and Schott [Tisch. 1872], read ἀναπληρώσετε, following B F G, 33, 35, and several vss. and Fathers. Looking at this amount of attestation, to which the vss. give special weight (including Pesch., Vulg. It.), and considering that the imperative might readily have been occasioned by the preceding imperatives, the aorist form being involuntarily suggested by the similar future form, the future is to be preferred.—Ver. 10. ἐργαζώμεθα] A B L, min., Goth. Oec. read ἐργαζόμεθα. Approved by Winer, but too feebly attested, especially as hardly any version is in favor of it. A mere error in transcribing, after the preceding indicatives θερίσομεν and ἔχομεν. Looking at the frequent confusion of ω and ο, we must also regard as a copyist's error the reading in ver. 12 of διώκονται, adopted by Tisch., and attested by A C, etc., instead of διώκωνται (B D, etc.). — Ver. 12. μή] is, with Lachm. and Tisch., following decisive testimony, to be placed after Χριστοῦ. — Ver. 13. περιτεμνόμενοι] B L, many min., also vss. and Latin Fathers, read περιτετμημένοι.[1] Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Scholz, and approved by Rinck and Reiche. And justly ; the preterite is absolutely necessary, as the Judaistic *teachers* are meant. The present has crept in as a mere mechanical error of the transcribers, who had just previously written περιτέμνεσθαι, and perhaps also recollected v. 3. — Ver. 14. τῷ before κόσμῳ is omitted by Lachm. [and Tisch. 1872.] on weighty evidence ; but it might be readily suppressed, owing to the preceding syllable γω, especially as the article might be dispensed with, and κόσμος just before was anarthrous.—Ver. 15. ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησου οὔτε] B, 17, Arm. Aeth. Goth. Chrys. Georg. Syncell. Jer. Aug. Ambrosiast., have merely οὔτε γάρ (Syr. Sahid., οὐ γάρ). Approved by Mill, Seml., Griesb., Rinck, Reiche ; adopted by Bengel, Schott, Tisch. Justly ; the Recepta is manifestly an amplifying gloss, derived from v. 6. — ἐστίν] Elz. and Matth. read ἰσχύει, against decisive evidence. Derived from v. 6. — Ver. 16. στοιχήσουσιν] [Tisch. 1872], following ℵ, B C** K L P, Vulg. Chrys. Cyr. Theodoret, Dam. But, A C* D E F G, 4, 71, Syr. utr. Sahid. It. Cyr. Victorin. Jer. Aug. Ambrosiast., read στοιχοῦσιν. Approved by Griesb., placed in the margin by Lachm., adopted by Tisch. [1859]. But the present suggested itself most readily to the unskilled transcribers, and what ground could these have had for the alteration in the future? — Ver. 17. κυρίου is omitted before Ἰησοῦ in A B C*, ℵ, 17, 109, Arr. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. ms. Petr. Alex. Suspected by Griesb., omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. A frequent addition, in this case specially derived from ver. 18 ; hence several witnesses add ἡμῶν.

Contents.—Continuation of the special admonitions begun in v. 26 (vv. 1–5) ; then an exhortation to Christian morality in general, with allusion to its future recompense (vv. 6–10). A concluding summary, in the apostle's own handwriting, of the chief polemical points of the epistle (vv. 11–16); after which Paul deprecates renewed annoyance, and adds the benediction (vv. 17, 18).

---

[1] In favor of this may probably be reckoned also F with περιτεμνήμοι, and G with περιτεμνημένοι, which betray through the wrongly written η perfect forms.

Ver. 1. Loving (*ἀδελφοί*) exhortation to a course of conduct opposed to *κενοδοξία*. — *ἐὰν καὶ προληφῇ κ.τ.λ.*] Correctly rendered in substance by the Vulgate: "etsi praeoccupatus fuerit homo in aliquo delicto." The meaning is: "*if even any one*[1] *shall have been overtaken by any fault*,—so, namely, that the sin has reached him more rapidly than he could flee from it (1 Cor. vi. 18, x. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 22). So Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, and most expositors, including Rückert and de Wette; and in substance also Wieseler, who, however, explains *προλ.* figuratively of a snare, *in* which (*ἐν*) one is unexpectedly (*προ*) *caught.*[2] There is, however, no intimation of this figure in the context (*καταρτίζετε*); and to explain *ἐν* the quite common *instrumental* use amply suffices, according to which the expression is not different from the mere dative. In a mild and trustful tone Paul conceives the sin, which might occur among his Galatians, only as "peccatum *praecipitantiae*," "a sin of precipitancy;" for this is, at any rate, intimated by *προληφϑῇ*. On *προλαυβάνειν*, *to overtake*, comp. Xen. *Cyn.* 5, 19; 7, 7; Theophr. *H. pl.* viii. 1. 3; Polyb. xxxi. 23. 8; Diod. Sic. xvii. 75; Strabo, xvi. p. 1120. In *ἐὰν καί* the emphasis is laid on *εἰ* (*if* even, *if* nevertheless).[3] Others[4] have explained *προληφϑῇ* as *deprehensus fuerit, is seized;* but against this view it may be urged that, as the word cannot be used as merely equivalent to the simple verb, or to *καταληφϑῇ*,[5] or *ἐγκαταληφϑῇ*,[6] no reference for the *προ* can be got from the context.[7] Even in Wisd. xvii. 17, *προληφϑείς* means *overtaken*, *surprised* by destruction. And the *καί* does not require that interpretation, because, while it *might* belong to *προληφϑῇ*,[8] so as to mean *also actually* caught,[9] or, by way of climax, *even caught*, it does not necessarily belong to it. — *ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοί*] Paul thus puts it to the consciousness of *every reader* to regard *himself* as included or not: *ye, the spritual*, that is, *who are led by the πνεῦμα ἅγιον.* The opposite: *ψυχικοί, σαρκικοί* (1 Cor. ii. 13 f., iii. 1). In the case of *δυνατοί*, Rom. xv. 1, the circumstances presupposed and the contrast are of a different character. Those very *πνευματικοί* might readily be guilty of an unbrotherly exaltation and severity, if they did not sufficiently attend to and obey the leading of the Spirit towards meekness. — καταρτίζετε] *bring him right*, into the proper, normal condition ; διορθοῦτε, Chrysostom.[1] A *figurative* reference to the setting of dislocated limbs[2] is not suggested by the context. — ἐν πνεύματι πραότητος] *through the Spirit of meekness*, that is, through the πνεῦμα ἅγιον producing meekness. For πνεῦμα should be understood, not with Luther, Calvin, and many others, of the *human spirit* (1 Pet. iii. 4), of the tendency of feeling or tone of mind,[3] but of the Holy Spirit, as is required by the very correlation with πνευματικοί.[4] But among the manifold καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος (v. 22), πραΰτητος brings prominently forward the very quality which was to be applied in the καταρτίζειν. *In that view* it is the " character palmarius hominis spiritualis," "the pre-eminent characteristic of the spiritual man," Bengel. — σκοπῶν σεαυτὸν κ.τ.λ.] *looking* (taking heed) *to thyself lest*, etc.[5] There is here a transition to the *singular*, giving a more individual character to the address ; just as we frequently find in classical authors that after the plural of the verb, the singular of the participle makes the transition from the aggregate to the individual.[6] Erasmus aptly remarks that the singular is "magis idoneus ad compellandam *uniuscujusque conscientiam*," "better adapted for addressing the individual conscience." There is therefore the less ground for considering these words as an apostolical *marginal note* (Laurent). — μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρ.] *lest thou also* (like that fallen one) *become tempted*, enticed to sin,—wherein the apostle has in view the danger of the enticement being *successful*.[7] Lachmann places a full stop after πραΰτητος, and connects σκοπῶν . . . πειρασθῇς with the words which follow ; a course by which the construction gains nothing, and the connection actually suffers, for the reference of καὶ σύ to τὸν τοιοῦτον is far more natural and conformable to the sense than the reference to ἀλλήλων.

---

[1] *ἄνϑρωπος*, as in ver. 7, and 1 Cor. xi. 28, iv. 1, *et al.*

[2] Comp. Goth. "*gafahâidáu*," that is, *caught.*

[3] See Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 519; Baeuml. *Partik.* p. 151.

[4] Grotius, Winer, Olshausen, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Hofmann.

[5] John viii. 4.

[6] Aeschin. *Ctes.* p. 62. 17.

[7] Grotius strangely interprets: "deprehensus *antequam haec epistola ad vos veniat*," "caught before this epistle come to you." Winer introduces more than the text warrants: "etiamsi quis *antea deprehensus fuerit in peccato*, eum tamen (*iterum peccantem*) corrigite," "even though one have been previously caught in sin, nevertheless correct him (again sinning)." Paul must have expressed this by *ἐὰν καὶ πάλιν ληφϑῇ.* Olshausen affirms that by *προ* the *λαμβάνεσια* is indicated as taking place *before* the *καταρτιζειν.* But *this* relation of time was so obvious of itself, that it would have been strange thus to express it. Hofmann interprets not more aptly: "*ere he repents of the sin*;" as if this idea could only be thus mentally supplied! Luther appropriately remarks, "if a man *should* somehow *be overtaken by a fault.*"

[8] Klotz, p. 521; Kühner, § 824, note 1.

[9] Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 17.

Ver. 2. ἀλλήλων] emphatically prefixed (comp. v. 26), opposed to the habit of selfishness : "*mutually one of the other* bear ye the burdens." τὰ βάρη, however, figuratively denotes the *moral faults* (comp. ver. 5) pressing on men with the sense of guilt, not everything that is oppressive and burdensome generally, whether in the domain of mind or of body,[8]—a view which, according to the context, is much too vague and general (vv. 1, 3, 5). The *mutual bearing* of moral burdens is the *mutual, loving participation in* another's *feeling of guilt*, a weeping with those that weep in a *moral* point of view, by means of which moral sympathy the pressure of the feeling of guilt is reciprocally lightened.[9] As to this *fellowship in suffering*, comp. the example of the apostle himself, 2 Cor. xi. 29. It is usually taken merely to mean, *Have patience with one another's faults* ;[1] along with which several, such as Rosenmüller, Flatt, Winer, quite improperly (in opposition to ἀλλήλων, according to which the burdened ones are the very persons affected by sin) look upon *βάρη* as applying to faults by which a person becomes burdensome to *others*. But the command, thus understood, would not even come up to what was required in ver. 1, and would not seem important and high enough to enable it to be justly said : καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν νόμον τ. Χρ.—*and in this way* (if ye do *this*) *ye will entirely fulfil the law of Christ*, the law which Christ has given, that is, the sum of all that He desires and has commanded by His word and Spirit, and which is, in fact, comprehended in the *love*[2] which leads us to *serve* one another. What Paul here requires is conceived by him as the *culminating point* of such a service. He speaks of the νόμος of Christ in relation to the Mosaic law,[3] which had in the case of the Galatians—and how much to the detriment of the sympathy of love—attained an estimation which, on the part of Christians, was not at all due to it ; they desired to be ὑπὸ νόμον, and thereby lost the ἔννομον Χριστοῦ εἶναι.[4] A reference at the same time to the *example* of Christ, who through love gave Himself up to death[5] (as contended for by Oecumenius and Usteri), is *gratuitously* introduced into the idea of νόμος. The compound ἀναπληρ is, as already pointed out by Chrysostom (who, however, wrongly explains it of a common fulfilment *jointly and severally*), *not* equivalent to the simple verb,[6] but more forcible : *to fill up*, *to make entirely full* (the law looked upon as a measure which, by compliance, is made full ; comp. v. 14), so that nothing more is wanting.[7] The thought therefore is, that without this moral bearing of one another's burdens, the fulfilment of the law of Christ is not complete ; *through* that bearing is introduced what *otherwise* would be *wanting* in the ἀναπλήρωσις of this law. And how true this is ! Such self-denial and self-devotion to the brethren in the ethical sphere renders, in fact, the very measure of *love* full,[8] so far as it may be filled up at all.[9]

---

[1] Comp. on 1 Cor. i. 10.

[2] Beza, Hammond, Bengel, and others.

[3] Rückert, de Wette, Wieseler, and others.

[4] See on 1 Cor. iv. 21.

[5] Comp. Soph. *Phil.* 506. In Plat. *Theaet.* p. 160 E, Luke xi. 35, it is differently used. Comp. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 209.

[6] See Bernhardy, p. 421 ; Lobeck, *ad Soph. Aj.* 191.

[7] Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 5.

[8] Matthies, Windischmann, Wieseler, Hofmann.

[9] Theodore of Mopsuestia, in Cramer's *Cat.* (and in Fritzsche, p. 129), well remarks that the bearing of one another's burdens takes place, ὅταν διὰ παραινέσεως καὶ χρηστότητος ἐπικουφίζῃς αὐτῷ τὴν ψυχὴν, ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος συνειδήσεως βεβαρημένην, "whenever by advice and kindness you relieve his spirit, weighed down by the consciousness of sin."

Ver. 3. *Argumentum e contrario* for the preceding καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρ. τ. ν. τ. Χρ. ; in so far as the fulfilment to be given *in such measure* to this law is impossible to moral conceit.—*For if any one thinks himself to be something*, imagines himself possessed of peculiar moral worth, so that he conceives himself exalted above such a mutual bearing of burdens, *while he is nothing*, although he is in reality of no moral importance, *he is*, so far from fulfilling the law of Christ, *involved in self-deception*. — On εἶναί τι, and the opposite μηδὲν εἶναι, *nullius momenti esse*, "to be of no account,"[10] comp. ii. 6, and see on Acts v. 36 ; 2 Cor. xii. 11 ; Locella, *ad Xen. Eph.* p. 143. As to μή with the participle, see Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 301. If μηδὲν ὤν be attached to the apodosis,[1] the effect is only to weaken the judgment which is expressed in it, because it would contain the fundamental statement (*since he is nothing*) in which the ἑαυτ. φρεναπ. is already *obviously* involved, and consequently, as the first portion of the affirmation in the apodosis, would anticipate the latter portion of it and take away its energetic emphasis. This is not the case, if the "being nothing" belongs to the antithetical delineation of conceited pretension in the protasis, where it is appropriate for the completeness of the case supposed. Moreover, μηδὲν ὤν is really applicable in the case of *every one*, Luke xvii. 10 ; Rom. iii. 23 ; 1 Cor. iv. 7, *et al.* — φρεναπατᾷ] denotes deception in the judgment, here in the *moral* judgment ; the word is not preserved in any other Greek author.[2]

---

[1] Rom. xv. 1.

[2] v. 13 f.

[3] Comp. v. 14.

[4] 1 Cor. ix. 21.

[5] Rom. xv. 3 ; Eph. v. 2.

[6] Rückert, Schott, and many others.

[7] Comp. Dem. 1466. 20 : ὧν ἂν ἐκλείπητε ὑμεῖς, οὐχ εὑρήσετε τοὺς ἀναπληρώσοντας, "you will not find such as will fill up those things as to which you are deficient." 1 Thess. ii. 16 ; Matt. xiii. 14. See Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 228 f. ; Winer, *de verbor. cum praepos. compos. in N. T. usu*, III. p. 11 f.

[8] 1 Cor. xiii. 4 ff.

[9] Rom. xiii. 8.

[10] Comp. Arrian. *Epict.* ii. 24 : δοκῶν μέν τι εἶναι, ὢν δ' οὐδείς, "to be of no account."

Ver. 4. But men ought to act in a way entirely different from what is indicated by this δοκεῖ εἶναί τι. "His own *work* let every man prove, and then," etc.—The emphasis lies on τὸ ἔργον (which is *collective*, and denotes the totality of the actions, as in Rom. ii. 7, 15 ; 1 Pet. i. 17 ; Rev. xxii. 12), opposing the *objective* works to the *subjective* conceit. — δοκιμαζέτω] not : *probatum reddat*,[3] "render approved," a meaning which it never has (comp. on 1 Cor. xi. 28), but : *let him try*, investigate of what nature it is. — καὶ τότε] *and then*, when he shall have done this (1 Cor. iv. 5), not : when he shall have found himself approved.[4] — εἰς ἑαυτὸν μόνον τὸ καύχημα ἕξει, κ.τ.λ.] does not mean, *he will keep his glorying for himself*,[5] that is, *abstinebit a gloriando*, "he will abstain from glorying ;"[6] for although ἔχειν may, from the context, obtain the sense of *keeping back*,[7] it is in this very passage restricted by καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἕτερον to its simple meaning, *to have ;* and καύχημα is not equivalent to καύχησις, but must retain its proper signification, *materies gloriandi*, "subject for glorying."[8] Nearest to the view of Koppe in *sense* come those of Winer : "non tantas in se ipso reperiet laudes, quibus apud alios quoque glorietur," "In himself he will not find such praise, of which to boast also before others ;" of Usteri : "then will he have to glory towards himself alone, and not towards others,"—a delicate way of turning the thought : "*then he will discover in himself faults and weaknesses sufficient to make him think of himself modestly ;*" and of Wieseler, "he will be silent toward others as to his καύχημα." But in accordance with the context, after the requirement of self-examination, the most natural sense for εἰς (on account of the antithesis, εἰς ἑαυτὸν — εἰς τὸν ἕτερον) is : *in respect to, as regards ;* moreover, in the above-named interpretations, neither the singular nor the article in τὸν ἕτερον obtains its due weight. The sentence must be explained : *then will he have cause to glory merely as regards himself, and not as regards the other* ; that is, then will he have cause to boast merely in respect of good of his own, which he may possibly find on this self-examination, and not in reference to the other, with whom otherwise he would advantageously compare himself. Castalio aptly remarks: "probitas in re non in collatione," "worth is in the thing, not in the comparison," and Grotius: "gaudebit recto sui examine, non deteriorum comparatione," "He will rejoice by a just examination of self, not by comparison with the worse"—as, for instance, was done by the Pharisee, who compared himself with robbers, adulterers, etc., instead of simply trying his own action, and not boasting as he looked to others, whom he brought into comparison.[1] *καύχημα with the article* denotes, not *absolute glory*,[2] which no one has (Rom. iii. 23), but the *relevant* cause for the καυχᾶσθαι which he finds in himself, so far as he does so, on that trial of his own work. It is therefore the καύχημα, supposed or conceived by Paul, as the result of the examination in the several cases.[3] This relative character of the idea removes the seeming inconsistency with vv. 3 and 5,[4] and excludes all untrue and impious boasting; but the taking καύχημα ἔχειν *ironically*,[5] or as *mimesis*,[6] is forbidden even by καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἕτερον. Hofmann interprets, although similarly in the main, yet without irony, and with a more exact unfolding of the purport: "*while otherwise he found that he might glory as he contrasted his own person with others, he will now in respect to the good which he finds in himself, seeing that he also discovers certain things in himself which are not good, have cause to glory only towards himself—himself, namely, who has done the good, as against himself who has done what is not good.*" But in this interpretation the ideas, which are to form the key to the meaning, are gratuitously imported; a paraphrase so subtle, and yet so clumsy, especially of the words εἰς ἑαυτὸν μόνον, could not be expected to occur to the reader. More simply, but introducing a different kind of extraneous matter, de Wette interprets: "*and then he will for himself alone* (to his own joy) *have the glory* (if he has any such thing, which is evidently called in question) *not for others* (in order thereby to provoke and challenge them)." But how arbitrary it is to assign to εἰς two references so entirely different, and with regard to καύχημα to foist in the idea: "if he has *aught such*"! A most excellent example of the εἰς ἑαυτὸν μόνον τὸ καύχημα ἔχειν is afforded by Paul himself, 2 Cor. x. 12.[7]

---

[1] Michaelis, Baumgarten, Morus, Jatho, Hofmann.

[2] But comp. φρεναπάτης, Tit. i. 10 ; Ignat. *Trall. interpol.* 6 ; Etym. M. 811. 3.

[3] Beza, Piscator, Rambach, Semler, Michaelis, Rückert, Matthies.

[4] Erasmus, Estius, Borger, and others.

[5] Comp. Hilgenfeld.

[6] Koppe.

[7] Hom. *Il.* v. 271, xxiv. 115 ; Eur. *Cycl.* 270.

[8] Rom. iv. 2 ; 1 Cor. v. 6, and always.

Ver. 5. Reason assigned, not for the summons to such a self-examination, but for the negative result of it, that no one will have to glory εἰς τὸν ἕτερον: *for every one will have to bear his own burden.* No one will be, in his own consciousness, free from the moral burden of his own sinful nature, which he has to bear. The *future* does not apply to the *last* judgment, in which every one will render account for his own sins,[1] and receive retribution,[2] — a view which, without any ground in the context, departs from the sense of the same figure in ver. 2, and also from the relation of time conveyed in ἕξει in ver. 4; but it denotes that *which will take place in every man after the self-examination referred to in ver.* 4: he will, in the moral consciousness, namely, produced by this examination, bear his own burden; and that will preclude in him the desire of glorying εἰς τὸν ἕτερον.—The distinction between βάρος and φορτίον (which is not *diminutive*) consists in this, that the latter denotes the burden in so far as it is *carried* (by men, beasts, ships, wagons; hence *freight, baggage,* and the like), while the former denotes the burden as *heavy* and *oppressive; in itself* the φορτίον may be light or heavy; hence: φορτία βαρέα,[3] and ἐλαφρα;[4] whereas the βάρος is always burdensome. The expression is *purposely chosen* here from its relative character.

---

[1] Comp. Calvin and others; also Reithmayr.

[2] Matthies.

[3] Bernhardy, p. 15.

[4] In opposition to de Wette.

[5] Against which Calvin justly pronounces.

[6] Bengel and others; also Olshausen: "a thorough self-examination reveals so much in one's own heart, that there can be no question of glory at all." So in substance Chrysostom and Theophylact hold that Paul has spoken συγκαταβατικῶς, "by accommodation," in order to wean his readers gradually from the habit of glorying; ὁ γὰρ ἐθισθεὶς μὴ τοῦ πλησίον ὡς ὁ Φαρισαῖος, κατακαυχᾶσθαι, ταχέως καὶ τοῦ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐναβρύνεσθαι ἀποστήσεται, "For becoming accustomed not, as the Pharisee, to exult over one's neighbor, he will abstain quickly even from private conceit," Theophylact. Comp. Oecumenius, according to whom the substantial sense is: ἑαυτοῦ καταγνώσεται, καὶ οὐχὶ ἑτέρων, "He will accuse himself, and not others."

[7] Comp. 2 Cor. i. 12 ff.

Ver. 6. In contrast to the referring of every one *to himself* (vv. 4, 5), there is now, by the κοινωνείτω δέ, which is therefore placed emphatically[5] at the beginning, presented a *fellowship* of special importance to a man's own perfection, which he must maintain: *Fellowship, on the other hand, let him who is being instructed in the doctrine*[6] *have with the instructor*[7] *in all good* (ver. 10), that is, let the disciple make common cause (endeavor and action) with his teacher in everything that is morally good. So, following Marcion (?) (in Jerome) and Lyra, in modern times Aug. Herm. Franke (in Wolf), who, however, improperly connects ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς, with κατηχοῦντι, Hennicke, *de nexu loci, Gal.* vi. 1–10, Lips. 1788; Mynster, *kl. theol. Schr.* p. 70, Matthies, Schott, Keerl, *Diss. de Gal.* vi. 1–10, Heidelb. 1834, Trana, Jatho, Vömel, Matthias; also not disapproved by Winer. Usually, however,[8] there is found in the words a summons to *liberality towards the teachers,* so that ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς is taken as referring to the communication of *everything good,*[9] or more definitely, of all *earthly good things,*[10] or of *good things of every kind;*[11] and κοινωνείτω is taken either *transitively,*[12] as if the word were equivalent to κοινοῦν:[13] *communicet*

---

[1] Augustine, *c. lit. Petil.* iii. 5; Luther.

[2] Jerome, Theodoret, Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, Calovius, Estius, Bengel, Michaelis, Borger, Rückert, and others; comp. also Hofmann.

[3] Matt. xxiii. 4; Ecclus. xxi. 16.

[4] Matt. xi. 30.

[5] In opposition to Hofmann.

[6] κατ' ἐξοχήν, "especially," in the gospel; comp. 1 Thess. i. 6; Phil. i. 14.

[7] The question, whether the persons here meant were permanent teachers of the church, or itinerant evangelists, is to be answered by saying that neither of these two kinds of teachers is excluded. For although at that time there were no διδάσκαλοι, "teachers," specially instituted except the presbyters (see on Eph. iv. 11), there were nevertheless members of the church endowed with the χάρισμα διδασκαλίας, "charism of teaching," who devoted themselves to the function of continuous instruction in their churches. Rom. xii. 7.

[8] As by Winer, Rückert, Usteri, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, and others.

[9] Ewald.

[10] "in omni facultatum genere, ut usu venit," "in every kind of resources, as the case may be," Bengel.

[11] Ellicott, Hofmann.

[12] So usually, also by Ewald.

[13] As to the distinction between the two, see especially Thuc. i. 39. 3.

(which, however, cannot be conclusively established in the N. T., not even in Rom. xii. 13 ; and in the passages from Greek authors[1] it is to be referred to the idea : "*to share with any one*"), or *intransitively* :[2] "*let him stand in fellowship*," namely by communication, or in the sense of the *participation* in the teacher, which is perfected ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγ.[3] But against the whole of this interpretation may be urged : (1) the singular want of connection of such a summons, not merely with what goes before,[4] but also with what follows,[5] wherein Paul inculcates Christian morality generally. (2) Since in vv. 1–5 *moral* faultiness was the point in question, the reference which most naturally suggests itself for ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς is a reference to *moral* good. (3) At the conclusion of this whole section in ver. 10, ἐργαζώμεθα τὸ ἀγαθὸν κ.τ.λ., τὸ ἀγαθόν is nothing else than the *morally* good. (4) The requirement itself, to communicate with the teacher *in all good things*, would, without more precise definition,[6] be so indeterminate and, even under the point of view of the possession as common property, Acts iv. 32,[7] which we do not meet with in Paul's writings, so little to be justified, that we cannot venture to attribute it—thus thrown out without any defining limitation—to the apostle, least of all in a letter addressed to churches in which misinterpretations and misuse on the part of antagonistic teachers were to be apprehended. Through the stress laid by Wieseler on the spiritual *counter-service* of the teacher,[1] the expression *ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς*, seeing that it must always involve that which is to be given by the disciples to their teacher, is by no means reduced to its just measure (the bodily maintenance as recompense for the *πνευμάτικα* received, 1 Cor. ix. 11 ; Phil. iv. 15); whilst Ewald's interpretation, "communication *in all good things*,"[2] cannot be linguistically vindicated either for *κοινων.* or for *ἐν.*[3] Paul would have said perhaps: *κοινὰ ποιείτω ὁ κ.τ.λ. τῷ κ. πάντα ἀγαθά*, or something similar in correct Greek. The objection raised against our interpretation,[4] that it is difficult to see why this particular relation of disciple and teacher should be brought into prominence, is obviated by the consideration that this very relation had been much disturbed among the Galatians by the influence of the pseudo-apostles (iv. 17), and this disturbance could not but be in the highest degree an obstacle to the success of their common moral effort and life. But in reference to de Wette's objection that *κοινωνεῖν*, instead of *μιμεῖσθαι*, is a strange expression, it must be observed that Paul wished to express not at all the idea of *μιμεῖσθαι*, but only that of the Christian *κοινωνία* between disciple and teacher. The disciple is not to leave the sphere of the morally good to the teacher alone, and on his own part to busy himself in other interests and follow other ways ; but he is to strive and work in common with his teacher in the same sphere. In this view, the expression is (in opposition to Hofmann's objection) neither too wide nor too narrow. Not too wide, because the sphere of moral good is one and the same for teachers and learners, and it is only the concrete application which is different. Not too narrow, because moral fellowship in Christian church-life finds its most effective lever in the fact that learner and teacher go hand in hand in all that is good. — *ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον*].[5] It is self-evident that Paul means only the relation to true, *Pauline* teachers. — *ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς*] the sphere, *in which* common cause is made.[6] A classical writer would say, *πάντων ἀγαθῶν*,[7] or *εἰς πάντα ἀγαθά*,[8] or even *περὶ πάντων ἀγ.*[9] On the *plural τὰ ἀγαθά*, as applied to moral good, comp. John v. 29 ; Matt. xii. 35 ; Ecclus. xi. 31, xvii. 7, xxxix. 4, xiii. 25 ; and frequently in Greek authors. Paul might also have written *ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ* ;[10] but *ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς* is more comprehensive. The dative *τῷ κατηχ.* is the *dativus communionis*, "dative of impartation," everywhere common.[11] [See Note LXXIV., p. 271 seq.]

---

[1] In Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* III. p. 81, and Bremi, *ad Aeschin.* p. 317, Goth.

[2] So Usteri, de Wette, Wieseler.

[3] Hofmann, comparing Rom. xv. 27.

[4] The connection with *what goes before* might be *dispensed with*, for Paul might (through δέ) have passed on to a fresh subject. Winer, indeed, conceives the connection to be : "cum vv. 4, 5 ea tetigisset, quae *priva* sibi quisque habere debeat, nunc ad haec descendere, quae cum aliis *communicanda* sunt," "When vv. 4, 5 he had touched on those things which every one should have as private to himself, he now descends to those which are to be shared with others" (comp. Erasmus, *Paraphr.*) But, with the precept of *liberality* towards teachers, so entirely alien to what goes before, this connection appears forced ; and it would be better to forego any connecting link with what precedes (Rückert) than to bring out an illogical relation of the contrast. de Wette discovers a satisfactory connection with vv. 1–5 in the circumstance that there, as here, the apostle has in view defects of Christian social life. This, however, is to specify not a connection, but merely a logical category. According to Ewald, the previous counsels are to be conceived as for the most part addressed to the Pauline teachers of the Galatians, and Paul therefore now adds a word as to the correct behavior of the non-teachers also. But the former idea is assumed without ground in the text, which speaks quite *generally*. According to Wieseler the conception is, that the care for worldly maintenance was a species of the βάρη, "burdens" (ver. 2), which the readers were to relieve them of in return for their being instructed in the word. But those βάρη, "burdens," are necessarily of a *moral* nature, burdens of *guilt*. According to Hofmann, Paul has previously exhorted every one to serve his neighbor with *that which he is*, and now exhorts every one to employ *that which he possesses*, as his Christian position requires. A scheme of thought purely artificial, and gratuitously introduced.

[5] The sequel down to ver. 10 is indeed referred by Luther (most consistently in 1538) and others, including Olshausen and de Wette, with more or with less (Koppe, de Wette, Hilgenfeld) consistency, to the *behavior towards the teachers*, by the despising of whom God is mocked, the support of whom is a sowing of seed for spiritual objects, etc. But looking at the general nature of the following instructions, which there is not a word to limit, how arbitrarily and forced is this view ! Not less far-fetched and forced is the explanation of Hofmann, who considers that, because by means of the κοινωνεῖν κ.τ.λ. the teacher is enabled to attend to his own business, Paul in vv. 7 ff. warns against the erroneous opinion that people might, without danger to the soul, deal lightly with that κοινωνεῖν κ.τ.λ.; that by means of this κοινωνεῖν people devote that which they possess to the Spirit, etc.

[6] Luther, 1538 : Paul desires simply, "*ut liberaliter eos alant, quantum satis est ad vitam commode tuendam*," "that they liberally support them, so far as is sufficient for the proper maintenance of life,"—an idea which is not suggested in the passage.

[7] de Wette.

Ver. 7. A warning to the readers, in respect to this necessary moral fellowship, not to allow themselves to be led astray (by the teachers of error or otherwise), with very earnest reference to the divine retribution. This nearest and easy connection makes it unnecessary to refer back to the whole of the section from ver. 1 onward.[1] [See Note LXXV., p. 272.] — *μὴ πλανᾶσθε*] See on 1 Cor. vi. 9. — *Θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται*] *God is not sneered at*, that is, *mocked;* He does not submit to it. See the sequel. This *mocking of God* (a more forcible expression of the idea *πειράζειν Θεῷ*) takes place on the part of him who, by immoral conduct, practically shows that he despises God and accounts nothing of His judgment. On *μυκτηρίζειν*, properly, *to turn up the nose*,[2] and then to *deride*, comp. Sueton. *Claud.* 4 : *σκώπτειν καὶ μυκτηρίζειν*, "to jeer at and deride."[3] — *ὃ γὰρ ἐὰν σπείρῃ κ.τ.λ.*] Proof for *Θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται*. The identity between the kind of seed sown and the kind of fruit to be reaped from it (*τοῦτο*, *this*, and nothing else ; for instance, from the sowing of weeds no wheat) is a figurative expression for the equivalent relation between moral action in the temporal life and the recompense at the judgment.[4]

---

[1] Comp. also Hofmann.

[2] Comp. Grotius: "*per omnes res bonas, i.e.*, non per alimenta tantum, sed et alia obsequia et officia," "not only by support, but by other services and offices."

[3] = ב, according to *Sprachl.* p. 484 f.

[4] See Rückert, Usteri, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler.

[5] Comp. Acts xviii. 25.

[6] Comp. Matt. xxiii. 30.

[7] Heb. ii. 14; Plat. *Rep.* p. 464 A ; Soph. *Trach.* 543.

[8] Plat. *Rep.* p. 453 A.

[9] Polyb. xxxi. 26. 6.

[10] Col. i. 10.

[11] Dem. 142, *ult.* 789. 2.

Ver. 8. *Ground assigned* for the foregoing proposition. "So it is, *since in fact* the two opposite *sorts of ground* which receive the seed will also yield two opposite kinds of *harvest*." In the words *ὃ ἐὰν σπείρῃ ἄνθρ. τοῦτο κ. θερίσει* Paul, as was required by the matter which he would figuratively present (*evil—good*), has conceived two different classes of seed, with two sorts of recipient soil likewise essentially different ; one class comprises all the kinds of seed which are sown to a man's own flesh, the other class includes all those which are sown to the Holy Spirit. He who scatters the former class of seeds, and therefore sows to his own flesh, will from this soil, which he has furnished with the corresponding seed, reap corruption, etc. Therefore we have not here any *alteration* in the figure, by which Paul leaves the description of the *seed*, and passes over to that of the *soil*,[5] but a *proof* that the state of the case, *in accordance with the two kinds of soil* which come into view, will not be other than is said in ver. 7. Observe the *ὅτι*, for the most part neglected by expositors, which is not explanatory, but *causative* ("*quoniam*," Vulgate). — *ὁ σπείρων εἰς τ. σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ*] that is, he who is minded and acts so that his own flesh—his sinfully-determined corporeo-psychical nature[6]—is the element conditioning and prompting his thoughts and actions. *ἑαυτοῦ* is added, because afterwards an *objective* principle, *τὸ πνεῦμα*, is opposed to this selfish *subjective* principle.[7] The idea that *εἰς τ. σάρκα*

---

[1] Wieseler.

[2] Comp. Horat. i. 6. 5; *Ep.* i. 19. 45.

[3] Sext. Emp. *adv. math.* i. 217; Job xxii. 19; Prov. i. 30, xii. 8; 3 Ezr. i. 51. Comp. also *μυκτήρ*, Diog. L. ii. 19; Lucian. *Prom.* 1; *μυκτηρισμός*, 2 Macc. vii. 39; and *μυκτηριστής*, Athen. iv. p. 182 A, v. p. 187 C.

[4] Comp. 2 Cor. ix. 6. The same figure is frequently used as to recompense, Hos. viii. 7; Job iv. 8; Prov. xxii. 8; Ecclus. vii. 2; Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 260 D; Arist. *Rhet.* iii. 4; Plut. *Mor.* p. 394 D; Cic. *de orat.* ii. 65: "ut sementem feceris, ita metes," "as you make the seeding, so will you reap."

[5] Rückert, Hofmann, according to whom it is only this alteration which explains the connection with ver. 6.

[6] Comp. v. 16 f.

[7] Luther (1519 and 1524), with strange arbitrariness, holds that Paul desires to obviate the thought "*de seminatione masculi in carnem feminae.*" But in 1533 he consistently abides by the reference to the attitude towards the teachers, and explains: "qui nihil communicat ministris verbi, *sed se solum bene pascit et curat*, id quod caro suadet," "who communicates nothing to the ministers of the Word, but only feeds well him-

ἑαυτοῦ applies to *circumcision*[1] is entirely foreign to the context. — *φθοράν*] *corruption*, *destruction*,[2] that is, here, in accordance with the contrast of *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, *the eternal ἀπώλεια*.[3] But the suggestion that *φθοράν* is used in reference to the *corruptibility* of the flesh,[4] cannot be entertained, because the true Christians who die before the *παρουσία* partake the lot of corruption, and the point of time for the harvest is conceived as not earlier than the nearly approaching *παρουσία* (ver. 9), in which either *φθορά* or *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* will be the result of the *judgment*. According to de Wette, Paul has chosen this expression in order to denote the *perishableness of carnal aims*, and at the same time their destructive consequences for the soul. This is arbitrary. The general idea of *φθοράν* obtains its more precise definition simply from *ζωὴν αἰών.*[5] — *ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα*] No more than in chap. v. does *τὸ πνεῦμα* here mean *the higher nature of man*,[6] but[7] it denotes *the Holy Spirit*. Jerome aptly remarks, that for this very reason Paul did not again add *ἑαυτοῦ* (which Ernesti would arbitrarily again *supply*). The less, therefore, the ground for misapplying the passage in favor of the meritoriousness of good works. The sense, when divested of figure, is : "he who is minded and acts so that the Holy Spirit is the element which determines and prompts him." — *ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει κ.τ.λ.*] At the *παρουσία*.[8] *φθορά* and *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* are conceived as the two kinds of *produce* which shall have sprung up from the two different *sorts of recipient soil*.

Ver. 9. Encouragement, not to become weary in that which is meant by *this second kind of sowing ; τὸ καλὸν ποιοῦντες* is the same as would be figuratively expressed by *εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα σπείροντες*. The *autem* (*δέ*), which simply marks the transition to this summons, cannot be attached to the exhortation in ver. 6, as appending to it another.[9] — *ἐκκακῶμεν*] As to this form, and the form *ἐγκακ.*,[10] see on 2 Cor. iv. 1. On the "slight paronomasia"[11] in *καλόν* and *ἐκκακ.*, comp. 2 Thess. iii. 13. He who loses moral *courage* (*ἐκκακεῖ*) loses also moral *strength* (*ἐκλύεται*). — *καιρῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ*] at the time expressly destined for the reaping (Matt. xiii. 30), by which is meant the time of the *παρουσία*, which man must await with perseverance in what is good.[12] — *μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι*] *not becoming weary*,[13] which is not to be understood of the not becoming fatigued *in the reaping*,[14] a contrast being therein discovered either

---

self, and attends to what the flesh advises," etc. Comp. Calovius and others ; also Hofmann : he who *applies that which he possesses to his own flesh*, in order to gratify its desires. We may add that the Encratites made use of our passage (see Jerome) as a ground for rejecting sexual intercourse and marriage ; holding that he who takes a wife sows to the flesh, etc.

[1] Pelagius, Schoettgen ; comp. Rückert and also Usteri.

[2] Rom. viii. 21 ; Col. ii. 22 ; 2 Pet. ii. 12 ; LXX. Ps. cii. 4 ; Wisd. xiv. 12 ; Thuc. ii. 47 ; Plat. *Pol.* viii. p. 546 A ; and frequently.

[3] The same thought is expressed in Rom. viii. 13 : *εἰ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆτε, μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν.* Comp. ver. 23.

[4] Winer, Schott, Reithmayr, and others ; comp. also Chrysostom and Theodoret.

[5] Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 17 ; 2 Pet. ii. 12.

[6] Rückert, Schott, and most expositors ; also Ernesti *Urspr. d. Sünde*, I. p. 60, II. p. 90 f.

[7] So also Wieseler and Hofmann.

[8] See also Rom. viii. 11, 15–17 ; 2 Cor. v. 5 ; Eph. i. 14.

[9] Hofmann.

[10] Lachmann, Tischendorf.

[11] Winer.

[12] Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 15 ; Tit. i. 3.

[13] Matt. xv. 32 ; Mark viii. 3 ; Heb. xii. 3 ; 1 Macc. iii. 17 ; Wetstein, I. p. 426 ; Loesner, p. 336.

[14] Thus expressing the idea : "Nulla erit

with the toils *of the harvest proper*,[1] or with the labor of *sowing*.[2] Either form of the contrast would yield a description of the eternal harvest, which would be feeble, superfluous, and almost trifling, little in harmony with the thoughtful manner of the apostle elsewhere. We may add, that it is not the *nature* of the harvest (which was obvious of itself from ver. 8), but the *time* of the harvest, which constitutes the point on which the μὴ ἐκκακ. is *grounded*; and therefore on καιρῷ ἰδίῳ Calvin aptly remarks, "Spe igitur et patientia suum desiderium sustineant fideles et refrenent," "In hope and patience, therefore, let believers sustain and restrain their longing." Hence μὴ ἐκλυόμ. is rather to be taken as: *if we do not become weary* in doing good.[3] This denotes the present state, by which the *future* harvest is conditioned. It involves not a clumsy repetition,[4] but a reiterated setting forth of the condition, urgently emphasizing its importance, by means of a correlate word which closes the sentence with emphatic earnestness.[5] Nor would μὴ ἐκλυθέντες have been more correct,[6] but on the contrary: "videndum, quod quoque loco tempus vel ferri possit," "we must consider what time in every place can be especially admitted," Herm. *ad Viger.* p. 773. Ewald's explanation: *undeniably*, that is, *necessarily*, is without support from linguistic usage. Hofmann incorrectly makes μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι begin a new sentence; for Paul always places ἄρα οὖν at the *commencement*, but here he would have fully preserved the emphasis of μὴ ἐκλ., if instead of ἄρα οὖν he had written merely οὖν, or merely ἄρα.

Ver. 10. Concluding exhortation of the section of the epistle which began at ver. 6, inferred from the preceding καιρῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν μὴ ἐκλ. (ἄρα οὖν). The specialty of this exhortation lies in ὡς καιρὸν ἔχομεν, which is therefore emphatically prefixed: *as we have a season suitable thereto.*[7] This seasonable time will have elapsed, when the παρουσία sets in; we must therefore utilize it as ours by the ἐργάζεσθαι τὸ ἀγαθόν. The same idea as the ἐξαγοράζεσθαι τ. καιρόν in Eph. v. 16; Col. iv. 5. Hofmann introduces the idea, that there will come for the Christians, even before the παρουσία, an "*hour of temptation*," in which they can only (?) *withstand evil, but not bestow good one on another.* This idea is in opposition to the context in ver. 9, and is nowhere else expressed; and its introduction rests on the incorrect explanation of ἐργάζ. τὸ ἀγαθόν as referring to beneficence, and on the wrong idea that the doing good will become impossible. — ὡς is the usual *as*, that is, *as corresponds with and is suitable to this circumstance, that we* καιρὸν ἔχομεν.[8] Others, likewise retaining the signification "*as*," interpret:

---

satietas vitae aeternae," "There will be no satiety of life eternal," Calovius. This is the meaning also of Luther's translation: "*without ceasing*" (Vulgate, *non deficientes*); comp. Estius.

[1] Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius.

[2] Usteri; the two ideas are combined by Chrysostom, Clarius, and others.

[3] See Photius in Oecumenius, p. 766 D, and Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, and nearly all modern expositors.

[4] Usteri.

[5] Comp. Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 336.

[6] Rückert, Hofmann.

[7] For instances of καιρὸν ἔχειν, *opportunum tempus habere*, see Wetstein.

[8] Comp. Luke xii. 58; John xii. 35; Clement, 2 Cor. 9; ὡς ἔχομεν καιρὸν τοῦ ἰαθῆναι, ἐπιδῶμεν ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεραπεύοντι Θεῷ, "as we have opportunity to be healed, let us give ourselves to the care of God that healeth."

prout habemus opportunitatem, "as we have opportunity," that is, when and how we have opportunity.[1] For this, indeed, no conditional ἂν would be necessary ; but how weak and lax would be the injunction ! Besides, καιρόν has obtained, by means of ver. 9, its quite definite reference. *Others* take ὡς as *causal.*[2] So Koppe, Paulus, Usteri (*because* we have time and opportunity), de Wette ; also Winer, who, however, does not decide between *quoniam*, "*since*," and *prout*, "*as.*" But ὡς, in the sense of *because*, is nowhere to be found in Paul's writings (not even in 2 Tim. i. 3). Most expositors explain it as *so long as*,[3] which, however, it never means, not even in Luke xii. 58. — τὸ ἀγαθόν] the *morally good*, not the *useful.*[4] Not merely the article, but also the use of the expression by Paul, in definite connection with ἐργάζεσθαι, as applying to morality active in works,[5] ought to have prevented the interpretation of τὸ ἀγαθόν, at variance with the context, as *benefits.*[6] Hofmann's interpretation ("do good towards others"), in more general terms evading the definite idea, amounts to the same thing. The ἀγαθόν in this passage is the same as τὸ καλόν in ver. 9. That which is *good* is also that which is morally *beautiful.* Comp. especially Rom. vii. 18 f. — πρός] *in relation to, in intercourse with* : see Winer, p. 378 f. ; Sturz, *Lex. Xen.* III. p. 698 ; Bernhardy, p. 265. — τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως] *the associates in the faith, believers.* οἰκεῖος, primarily *inmate of the house*, comes to be used generally in the sense of *special appertaining to*,[7] without further reference to the idea of a house. So with the genitive of an abstract noun, as οἰκεῖοι φιλοσοφίας, "associates of philosophy" (Strabo, I. p. 13 B), γεωγραφίας, "of geography" (Strabo, I. p. 25 A.), ὀλιγαρχίας, "of the oligarchy" (Diod. Sic. xiii. 91), and the like in Wetstein, p. 236 ; Schweigh. *Lex. Polyb.* p. 401.[8] The πίστις is the *Christian* faith ; those who belong to it are the πιστεύοντες. The opposite would be : τοὺς ἀλλοτρίους τῆς πιστ. The idea that the *church* is the οἶκος Θεοῦ[9] is improperly introduced here, in order to obtain the sense : "*qui per fidem sunt in eadem atque no, familia Domini*," "who are by faith in the same family of God as we."[10] For τῆς πίστεως conveys the complete definition of τοὺς οἰκείους ; and the sense mentioned above must have been expressed by some such form as τοὺς ἡμῶν οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως.[11] Paul might also simply have written πρὸς τοὺς πιστεύοντας ; but the expression οἰκείους τ. π. suggests *a stronger motive.* Among the πᾶσι, in relation to whom we have to put into operation the morally good, *those who belong to* the faith have the chief claims—because these claims are based on the special sacred *duty of fellowship* which it involves—in preference to those who are *stran-*

---

[1] Thus Knatchbull, Homberg, Wolf, Zachariae, Hilgenfeld.

[2] Heindorf, *ad Gorg.* p. 113 ; Matthiae, p. 1511.

[3] So Flatt, Rückert, Matthies, Schott, Olshausen.

[4] Olshausen.

[5] Rom. ii. 10 ; Eph. iv. 28.

[6] Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Estius, and many others, including Schott, de Wette, and Wieseler.

[7] Comp. LXX. Isa. lviii. 7.

[8] Comp. τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς οἰκεῖα, "things conformable with virtue," 2 Macc. xv. 12 ; τὰ τῆς φύσεως οἰκεῖα, "things conformable with the nature," Dem. 1117. 25.

[9] 1 Tim. iii. 15 ; Heb. iii. 2, v. 6, x. 21 ; 1 Pet. iv. 17.

[10] Beza ; comp. Estius, Michaelis, and others, also Schott and Olshausen, Wieseler, and Ewald, who limits the idea to the same *church.*

[11] Comp. Phil. ii. 30, *et al.* ; Winer, p. 180, rem. 3.

gers to the faith, although in respect even to the latter that conduct is to be observed which is required in Col. iv. 5, 1 Thess. iv. 12.

Note. — If the reading ἐργαζόμεθα (see the critical notes), which is followed by Ewald, were the original one, the indicative would not (with Winer in his *Commentary*, but not in his *Gramm.* p. 267) have to be taken as a stronger and more definite expression instead of the *hortative subjunctive* (*do we therefore the good*), since this use of the *present indicative* (Jacobs, *ad Ach. Tat.* p. 559, *ad Delect. epigr.* p. 228 ; Heindorf, *ad Gorg.* p. 109 ; Bernhardy, p. 396) in non-interrogative language (John xi. 47) is foreign to the N. T., although opportunities for it often presented themselves. The interpretation of the whole sentence *as an interrogation* has been rightly given up by Lachmann (also at Rom. xiv. 19), because so complete an interruption by a question does not occur elsewhere in Paul's writings, and the addition *μάλιστα δὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως* indicates that the passage is of the nature of an assertion, and not of a question. *ἐργάζομεθα τὸ ἀγαθόν* would rather represent the matter *as actually taking place* (*we do it, we hold it so*, it is our maxim), and would thus belong to the *ideal* delineation of Christian life common with the apostle ; which might indeed be highly appropriate in its place at the conclusion of a discourse as a note of triumph, but here, in immediate connection with mere exhortations and injunctions, would be somewhat out of place.

Vv. 11–18. Final section of the epistle in the apostle's own handwriting. The main points of controversy are here briefly summed up : then in ver. 17 a repetition of molestations is deprecated, and ver. 18 concludes with the farewell blessing.

Ver. 11. Not "an *odd* verse," the purport of which is "a *singular whim* :"[1] on the contrary, in accordance with his well-known manner in other passages,[2] *Paul adds to the letter, which up to this point he had dictated,*[3] *the conclusion from ver.* 11 *onward in his own handwriting.*[4] By means of these *autograph* endings the epistles indicated their *authentic* character.[5] But this close of our *epistle*, as stringently comprehending all its main points once more, was intended to catch the eyes of the readers as *something so specially important, that from ver.* 12 *to the end the apostle wrote it with very large letters,*[6] just as we, in writing and printing, distinguish by letters of a larger size anything that we wish to be considered as peculiarly significant. To this point, and consequently to the quite special importance of the addition now made at the end, not by the hand of the amanuensis, but by his own hand in large writing, Paul calls the attention of his readers, and says: "*See with how great letters I have written* (the sequel, from ver. 12) *to you with my own hand!*" Neither ἴδετε[1] nor ἔγραψα[2] is at variance with the reference to what follows; for Paul, following the custom of letter-writers, has in his mind not the present point of time, when he *is just about* to write, but *the* point of time, when his readers have received the letter and consequently *see* what and how *he has written.*[3] Just in the same way in Philem. 19, ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρί points to *what follows.* In keeping with this is the similarly common use of ἔπεμψα, "respectu habito temporis, quo alter donum accipiebat," "respect being had to the time wherein another received the gift."[4] Holsten, Voemel, Matthias, Windischmann, Reithmayr, agree with our view. Grotius also ("sua manu scripsit *omnia, quae jam* sequuntur," "With his own hand he wrote all that now follows"), Studer, and Laurent refer the words to what follows. Grotius, however, contrary to the *usus loquendi*, explains πηλίκοις as *how much*, thus making Paul call attention to the *length* of his autograph conclusion; and Studer understands it as referring to the *unshapeliness* of the letters (in opposition to this, see below); while Laurent,[5] against the signification of the word, adheres to the *qualibus*, "*what sort*," of the Vulgate, and is of opinion that Paul wrote this conclusion of the letter in the *cursive* character. Usually, however (as also by Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann [Eadie]), ver. 11 is referred *to the whole epistle*, which Paul had written with his own hand,[6] πηλίκοις being explained[7] as referring to the *unshapeliness of the letters*,[8] arising from want of practice in writing

---

[1] Usteri.

[2] 1 Cor. xvi. 21 ; Col. iv. 18 ; 2 Thess. iii. 17.

[3] Comp. Rom. xvi. 22.

[4] From 2 Thess. iii. 17 it is to be assumed that Paul closed *all* his epistles with his own hand, even when he does not expressly *say so.*

[5] See 2 Thess. ii. 2, iii. 17.

[6] The principal emphasis is on the word πηλίκοις, which is therefore placed apart ; the secondary stress lies on τῇ ἐμῇ χειρί. It may, however, be doubtful whether Paul wrote *merely* ver. 12 with larger letters, and the sequel with his own hand but in his ordinary mode of writing, *or* whether he continued the large characters down to ver. 16 *or* to ver. 18. The internal connection of vv. 12–16, the uniform solemn tone of these verses down to their solemn conclusion, and the abrupt character of ver. 17, all unite in inducing us to adopt the *second* view.

---

[1] In opposition to Rückert and Schott.

[2] In opposition to Usteri.

[3] Philem. 19, 21; 1 John ii. 14, 21; Acts xv. 27, xxiii. 30; Rom. xvi. 22; Thuc. 1. 1 *in.*; Isocr. *ad Demonic. in.*

[4] Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 9. 25; comp. Krüger, § 53. 10. 1.

[5] In the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1864, p. 644 ff., and in his *neut. Stud.* p. 125. 5.

[6] In adopting this view various grounds have been guessed for its autograph composition. Pelagius: "that Paul desired to show that *he was not afraid!*" Ambrosiaster, comp. Augustine and Michaelis: "that he desired to prove the *genuineness of the epistle.*" Chrysostom (who, moreover, assumes in addition the cause assigned by Pelagius), Luther, Calvin, Calovius, and many others: "that his intention was to show the Galatians his *earnest care* for them, to make them attentive in reading, and the like." Hilgenfeld: "that he *attached so much importance* to the epistle." Ewald: "that *Timothy had not been with him just* at the time when he composed the epistle; and he thus wished, in the postscript written at a somewhat later period, to make excuse for the large inelegant letters in which the epistle had been written." Hofmann: "that the autograph writing was intended *to bring the apostle as it were vividly before the eyes of his readers.*" Hofmann is also of opinion that Paul had not elsewhere written with his own hand, that he might not needlessly curtail the time for procuring his bodily maintenance. As if the *dictating* to the pen of another would not have involved just as much loss of time! Tertius and Timothy were hardly shorthand writers. Or is Paul supposed to have been occupied in tent-making *during the time when* he was dictating his letters, which presuppose so much abstraction and concentration of mental labor?

[7] With Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Cajetanus, Estius, Winer, Rückert, Usteri, Hilgenfeld.

[8] This is not, as is often stated, the view of Jerome, who, on the contrary, specifies this view only to reject it, and assumes that down to ver. 11 the epistle was written by the amanuensis, but after ver. 11 by Paul himself in very large characters, in order that his readers should recognize his genuine handwriting and at the same time his solicitous care for them. Jerome therefore comes nearest to our view, but introduces into the πηλίκοις purposes which have no natural connection with the largeness of the characters, and could not, without further intimation, have been understood by the reader. Theodore of Mopsuestia ex-

Greek; *or* πηλίκ. γράμμ. being explained as: *what a large letter* I have written to you. So most expositors, including de Wette and Hofmann. But against this *latter* view—although the epistle, notwithstanding 1 Pet. v. 12, Heb. xiii. 22, would no doubt be long enough for an *autograph* one—may be urged the very use which it assumes of γράμματα for ἐπιστολή,[1] since Paul elsewhere always calls an epistle ἐπιστολή;[2] and, on the other hand, he just as constantly uses the word γράμμα, in the *singular*[3] and *plural*,[4] to express the idea of *a letter* of the alphabet; and also the decisive consideration that the employment of the *dative* (*instrum.*), instead of the *accusative*,[5] would be quite in opposition to all usage.[6] The *dative* would only be suitable if, instead of ἔγραψα, παρεκάλεσα perhaps, or some suitable word, followed. Against the *former* interpretation, which refers the word to the *unshapeliness* of the letters, it may be urged that the idea of ἀμορφία is arbitrarily *introduced* into πηλίκοις, as this quality is by no means an *essential* characteristic of *large* letters; secondly, that the charge of want of practice in writing Greek cannot be proved. The native of Tarsus and Roman citizen, who from his youth had enjoyed a learned training in Jerusalem, where the Greek language was very current among the Jews[7]—the man who handled with so much delicacy and skill the Greek literary language, who was familiar with the works of the Greek poets,[8] and who was in constant intercourse with Greek Jews and Gentiles,—is it to be thought that such an one should not have possessed even the humble attainment of writing Greek without making the letters of an unshapely size? In Wieseler's view, the *large* letters were very *legible* (for the public reading of the epistle); and in calling attention to this circumstance, Paul desires to bring into prominence his great love for his readers, which shuns no trouble on their account. But even thus the matter would amount only to a trifle. The Galatians were in possession of far greater proofs of his love than the size of the char-

---

plains it better, likewise understanding πηλίκοις γράμμασιν correctly (μείζοσιν ἐχρήσατο γράμμασιν, "he used larger letters"), and specifying as Paul's object that μέλλων καθάπτεσθαι τῶν ἐναντίων, "being about to assail his adversaries," he wished to intimate that he neither ἐρυθριᾷ οὔτε ἀρνεῖται τὰ λεγόμενα, "is ashamed of nor disowns what he has said." [See Note LXXVI., p. 272.]

[1] Taking the word by itself, there can be no doubt that γράμμα (*scriptum*, 2 Tim. iii. 15, John v. 47) may, according to the context, mean *epistle*, so that in the plural it would denote *epistolae* (Acts xxviii. 21, and often in Greek authors), but may also apply to a *single* epistle. Thus, for instance, Thuc. vii. 8. 3, where ἐπιστολή is used shortly before; Xen. *Cyr.* iv. 5. 26, where ἐπιστολή occurs immediately after; Xen. *Eph.* ii. 5 and Locella *in loc.* Comp. also Luke xvi. 6; 1 Macc. iv. 10, 14; Ignat. *Rom.* 8, *ad Polyc.* 7.

[2] 1 Cor. v. 9, xvi. 3; 2 Cor. iii. 1 f., x. 10; 2 Thess. ii. 2, iii. 14, 17.

[3] Rom. ii. 27, 29, vii. 6; 2 Cor. iii. 6.

[4] 2 Cor. iii. 7.

[5] Acts xxiii. 25; Rom. xvi. 22; 2 Pet. iii. 1.

[6] Quite irrelevantly Hofmann compares the usage of combining a verb with the abstract noun derived from it in the dative (Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 159); and just as irrelevantly the expression εἰπεῖν λόγῳ, Matt. viii. 8 (see on this passage), Luke vii. 7. Not even that use of εἰπεῖν λόγῳ, in which it may denote *to deliver as an orator* (Krüger *on Thuc.* i. 22. 1), would here be analogous. Only such phrases as, *e.g.*, χρυσοῖς γράμμασι γράφειν, to write with *golden letters*, Lucian. *Alex.* 43; μεγάλοις γράμμ. ἀναγράφειν, to write down in *large letters*, *Gymn.* 22; γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς, Luke xxiii. 38, Elz.; φοινικίοις γράμμ., Soph. *Fragm.* 460 D, really correspond.

[7] See Hug, *Einl.* II. § 10.

[8] See on Acts xvii. 28.

acters in his own handwriting, which, besides, might be something very different from legibility.

Ver. 12.[1] *All those whose wish and will are directed to making a fair show in the flesh*, that is, to the having a specious appearance, while they are involved in fleshly habits,—*this* class of men *force circumcision upon you*, and they *do so solely for the reason that they may not bring on themselves persecution on account of the cross of Christ.* This persecution they would incur on the part of the Jews, if they preached the cross of Christ and at the same time *rejected circumcision;* whereas, by *insisting on circumcision*, they disarmed the zeal of the Jews for the law,[2] and removed from the cross of Christ all occasion of their experiencing persecution for it.[3] In order to understand the passage rightly, we must note that the emphasis is on εὐπροσωπῆσαι (not on ἐν σαρκί) : they desire to combine *a pleasing exterior* with an unspiritual, carnal state of life, in which they really are. Thus is characterized the *hypocritical* conduct of these people, whose jesuitry makes them resemble the τάφοις κεκονιαμένοις (Matt. xxiii. 27 ; comp. Acts xxiii. 3).[4] So many as belong to this *dissembling class, they* constrain you to be circumcised ! — εὐπρόσωπος] *speciosus facie*, "*fair of face*," sometimes applied to actual beauty of person,[5] and sometimes to a mere specious appearance,[6] is very commonly used among Greek authors ;[7] but εὐπροσωπεῖν is not preserved elsewhere in the literary language.[8] — ἐν σαρκί] is the element of the sinful nature of man,[9] in which, instead of being renewed and refined by the Holy Spirit, those hypocrites are found living, and at the same time endeavor to give to themselves a good coloring which would prepossess the opinion of others in their favor. The juxtaposition of the words, "*to look fair in the flesh*," reveals the *moral contradiction* in their nature, and delineates their whole portraiture, as if with one sharp touch, indignantly, vigorously, and appropriately. The words are usually explained : "those who desire to be well-pleasing *by means of outward carnal things, such as circumcision and the observance of the ceremonial law generally.*"[10] Of course ἐν σαρκί might, *ex adjuncto*, obtain the sense, *by means of circumcision and observance of the law*,[11] but in this passage the context suggests no ground for thinking of anything else than that which was just shortly before meant by σάρξ, in the contrast drawn between σάρξ and πνεῦμα.[12] And how feeble and inexpressive, when placed at the commencement of so energetic a passage, would be the description of the misleaders which this interpretation would yield ! Holsten interprets in a similar way, but develops the sense more accurately, and takes ἐν σαρκί as the sphere in which the εὐπρ. manifests itself, "all who desire a fair show *in the fleshly domain ;*" this applies in the concrete to *circumcision*, which could have true significance only as a sign of inward righteousness,[1] but to which these persons adhered "*for its fair show of righteousness.*" But it is not until ver. 13 that *σάρξ* obtains its reference in harmony with the text to circumcision ; in respect to which, moreover, the idea, that circumcision is the *seal of righteousness*, is not at all intimated in the connection of our passage. Lastly, Chrysostom and his successors, Erasmus, Calvin, Estius, Grotius, and others, have assigned to *ἐν σαρκί* the unmeaning sense *παρ' ἀνθρώποις* ; and Hofmann has arrived at the trifling interpretation, that the idea meant was "*a pleasing cheerfulness of outward appearance, springing from and testifying to a natural amiability*, to which the opponents of the apostle aspired : *they would fain appear with the expression of natural amiability.*" Thus the description of the opponents placed at the head of this final outburst, so full of holy severity and indignation, would simply amount to the assertion of an amiable *bonhommie*, "good-fellowship," by which they were impelled. Holsten justly designates this view as *inconceivable.* [See Note LXXVII., p. 272.] — *ἀναγκάζουσιν*] they are occupied with, busy themselves in, forcing circumcision upon you.[2] As to the idea of *ἀναγκάζ.* see on Matt. xiv. 22.[3] — *μόνον ἵνα*] *merely from the* (self-interested) *motive, that they, etc.* — *τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*] that is, *on account of* the cross of Christ, because they preach Christ as *crucified.* The instrumental dative denotes the cause of the persecution. See Rom. xi. 20 ; 2 Cor. ii. 12 ; Bernhardy, p. 101 f. ; Winer, p. 202 f. So most expositors, including Rückert, Matthies, Usteri, Schott, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann. But others explain the words according to the idea of the *παθήματα Χριστοῦ* :[4] "*ne participes fiant suppliciorum Christi,*" "lest they may become partakers of Christ's sufferings," Winer ; comp. Jerome, Luther, Grotius, Semler, Michaelis, Koppe, Morus, de Wette, Ewald. The evident reference to v. 11[5] is decidedly opposed to this interpretation, even apart from the singular nature of the idea *τῷ σταυρῷ διώκεσθαι* (Paul would have written *ταῖς θλίψεσι* or the like).

---

[1] As to vv. 12-16, see the excursus of Holsten, *z. Evang. d. Paul u. Petr.* 343 ff.

[2] Comp. on v. 11.

[3] Note the critically correct position of the μή.

[4] Comp. 2 Cor. v. 12.

[5] As Xen. *Mem.* i. 3. 10.

[6] As Herod. vii. 168 ; Dem. 277. 4 ; Lucian. *Herm.* 51.

[7] Comp. Gen. xii. 11.

[8] In Dion. Hal. iii. 11 we find εὐπροσωπία ; in Symmachus, Ps. cxli. 6, εὐπροσωπίσθησαν. Comp. φαινοπροσωπεῖν, Cic. *Att.* vii. 21, xiv. 21 ; σεμνοπροσωπεῖν, Arist. *Nub.* 363.

[9] Ver. 8, iii. 3, v. 17.

[10] Rückert ; comp. Beza, Gomarus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Winer, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, and others.

[11] Comp. Rom. ii. 28.

[12] Comp. Wieseler.

Ver. 13. They have no other design than merely that stated in ver. 12 (*ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ κ.τ.λ.*). *For* so far from its being their aim, by the enforcement of circumcision, to re-establish the observance of the law among you, *not even the circumcised* (who are in question) *themselves*, for their own part, *keep the law*, but *δι' ἀνθρωπίνην φιλοτιμίαν ταῦτα πάντα γίνεται ὑπὲρ ἀρεσκείας τῶν ἀπίστων*, "through human ambition all this is done to please the unbelieving," Chrysostom. — *οἱ περιτετμημένοι*] is said contemptuously, and with indignation, of the fraternity of the false apostles, of whom it might at least have been expected that they themselves would combine obedience to the law with their being circumcised.[1] But the *ground* for their non-observance of the Mosaic law is conceived by Paul to be, neither their distance from Jerusalem,[2] nor the general impossibility of a complete fulfilment of the law[3] — both of which would be exculpatory, and wholly unsuited to the idea of the worthlessness of the persons concerned, — but *their hypocritical badness.*[4] It is true that, among the Jews generally, notwithstanding their self-conceit, there was a deficiency in their obedienceto the law ;[5] but an observance of the law might have been expected at all events from these περιτετμημένοι, who were such champions for circumcision and insisted on it so much (ver. 12). Yet *not even they themselves*, etc. — ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετ. σαρκί καυχ.] The σάρξ is not to be here taken again in an ethical sense, as in ver. 12 ;[6] but, according to the close and definite connection with περιτέμνεσθαι, it must be taken as referring to the *corporeal nature*, so far as it is in it that circumcision takes place.[7] The emphasis is, however, on ὑμετέρᾳ ;[8] hence

---

[1] Rom. iii. 25 f.

[2] See Bernhardy, p. 370.

[3] Comp. ii. 3, 14.

[4] See on 2 Cor. i. 5 ; Col. i. 24.

[5] Holsten holds the peculiar view, that what is in v. 11 expressed *objectively*, receives here a *subjective* turn : "*in order that they* (*those who are offended*) *should no more be persecuted through* (*the offence at*) *the cross.*" The *σταυρὸς τ. Χ.* had, in his view, been to the Jewish Christians an *obscure point*, and in presence of the Pauline churches a *painful wound*, by the *recollection* of which they were, in a metaphorical sense, *persecuted.* But what plain reader would have been able to unriddle a sense so enigmatically wrapped up—a sense which Paul might easily have expressed in clear words?

---

[1] As at any rate the false teachers are meant, and these were *Jewish Christians*, the reading περιτεμνόμενοι is plainly absurd. They were, in fact, not subjected to circumcision (Reithmayr), but *circumcised*, and could not therefore be designated, "according to their quality as Jews" (Moeller on de Wette), as περιτεμνόμενοι (*present*). See especially Reiche, p. 93. The idea that these men were formerly *Gentiles*, part of whom were still *on the point* of accepting circumcision, and that their *adherents* are included (de Wette), is quite as unhistorical (see Acts xv. 1, 5 ; 2 Cor. xi. 22 ; Acts xi. 20–22) as the expedient of Hilgenfeld is groundless : that among those false teachers ("the circumcision-people") the act of circumcision had still *continued*, not merely outwardly in the reception of the newly-born and proselytes (in that case Paul must have said οἱ περιτέμνοντες), but also inwardly, by virtue of the significance ascribed to it. In his *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 220, Hilgenfeld appeals to οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι in the *Act. Petr. et Pauli*, 63 ; but wrongly, because there (see the sequel) the subject is moral circumcision. The view of Neander is also mistaken, p. 366. According to Wieseler and Matthias, who likewise read περιτεμνόμενοι, the περιτεμνόμενοι were those among the *Galatian Gentile Christians*, who, led away by the pseudo-apostles, *allowed themselves to be circumcised.* In that case we must with these expositors make the seducers themselves, the pseudo-apostles, the subject of ϑέλουσιν. But this view is intolerable ; how could Paul enable the reader to guess this change of subject ? The subject of φυλάσσ. must also be the subject of ϑέλουσιν, or else Paul must have written as awkwardly as possible. Consequently the subject of both the verbs can only be the false apostles, who, however, were περιτετμημένοι, and not περιτεμνόμενοι. —Hofmann and Holsten are of opinion that the present participle is intended to denote the *Jews generally*, inasmuch as *circumcision was in use* among them. Against this view it may be decisively urged, that the subjects of the following ϑέλουσιν can be no other than οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι, and thus likewise the Israelites generally (as Hofmann consistently explains it) ; nevertheless these ϑέλοντες (ver. 13) must necessarily be the very same as those to whom the ϑέλουσιν in ver. 12 applies, and therefore not the Jews generally, but the *Judaistic adversaries*. Moreover, to these only is the οὐδέ, *not even*, suitable, which presupposes in those concerned a *higher degree* of obligation than in the case of others who were bound to obey the law. The forced expedient of Holsten is highly arbitrary : that Paul included the false teachers (consequently, according to our reading and interpretation, the περιτετμημένοι) in the *category* of those *circumcising themselves* (and therefore the περιτεμνόμενοι). Comp. Stallbaum, *ad Euthyphr.* p. 12 ; Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 613.

[2] Theodoret and others ; also Schott.

[3] Jerome, Estius ; comp. Usteri.

[4] Comp. ver. 12.

[5] Rom. ii. 17–23.

[6] Wieseler, comp. Ewald.

[7] Eph. ii. 11 ; Col. ii. 13.

[8] Not on σαρκί (Matthias, Holsten), as if Paul had written τῇ σαρκὶ ὑμῶν. Comp. 2 Cor. viii. 8, Rom. xi. 31, 1 Cor. xv. 31, where the pronoun, rarely used by Paul, is likewise emphatic.

Olshausen is the more wrong in finding a contrast—which is quite out of place here—to the *souls*, which those false teachers ought to have sought after. The antithetic element of *τῇ ὑμετ.* lies in the conceit of the *περιτετμημένοι* as to *their own* circumcision, as the correlate of which the circumcision of the *Galatian Gentile Christians*, to be effected by them, was to be the subject of their boasting. But this sentence of purpose is *parallel* to the *ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ κ.τ.λ.* contained in ver. 12, seeing that the pseudo-apostles in fact by this intended boasting—of their diffusion of theocratic Judaism by the circumcision of Gentile Christians which they procured—thought to avert the persecutions of the Jews ; Theophylact : *ἵνα ἐν τῷ κατακόπτειν τὴν ὑμετέραν σάρκα καυχήσωνται ὡς διδάσκαλοι ὑμῶν καὶ μαθητὰς ὑμᾶς ἔχοντες*, "that in cutting your flesh they may boast that they are your teachers and have you as disciples." It is a *καυχᾶσθαι*, in the face not of *heathenism*,[1] but of the *non-Christian Judaism*, from whose side the persecution on account of the cross of Christ (ver. 12) was threatened.

Ver. 14. By way of contrast, not to the *national vanity* of the Jews,[2] but to the *καυχᾶσθαι* which the *pseudo-apostles* had in view, Paul now presents *his own principle : "from me, on the other hand, far be it to glory, except only in the cross of Christ."* — *ἐμοὶ μὴ γένοιτο καυχ.*] *mihi ne accidat, ut glorier*, "to me let it not happen to glory." On this deprecating expression with the *infinitive*, comp. LXX. Gen. xliv. 7, 17 ; Josh. xxii. 29, xxiv. 16 ; 1 Macc. xiii. 5, 9, 10 ; Ignat. *Eph.* 12 ; Xen. *Cyr.* vi. 3. 11 : *ὦ Ζεῦ μέγιστε, λαβεῖν μοι γένοιτο αὐτόν*, *Anab.* i. 9. 18 ; Dem. xxxiii. 25 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 366. — In the words *εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ* down to *κόσμῳ*, observe the defiant enthusiasm, which manifests itself even in the fulness of the expression. How very different the conduct of the opponents, according to ver. 12 ! Nothing but the *cross of Christ* is to be the subject of *his καυχᾶσθαι* ; nothing, namely, but the redemption accomplished on the cross by Christ constituted the basis, the sum, and the divine certainty of his faith, life, hope, action, etc.[3] Thus it is a truly apostolic *oxymoron : καυχᾶσθαι ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ*. The cross is "*τὸ καύχημα τῶν καυχημάτων*, "the boast of boasts," Cyril. — *δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρ. κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ*] reveals the *cause* why he may not glory *in anything else : "through whom the world is crucified to me, and I* (*sc. ἐσταύρωμαι*) *unto the world*," that is, "by whose crucifixion is produced the result, that no internal fellowship of life longer exists between me and the world : it is dead for me, and I for it." By Calvin, Bengel, Winer, Usteri, Hofmann, Holsten, Matthias, Reithmayr, and others, *δι' οὗ* is referred to the *cross*. But it is more pertinent to refer it to the fully and triumphantly expressed subject immediately preceding, *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* :[4] *through whom*, that is, according to the context, *by means of whose crucifixion*. [See Note LXXVIII., p. 272.] This effect is dependent on the inward fellowship with the death of Christ[5] commenced by faith, and maintained by the

---

[1] Holsten.

[2] Hofmann, in accordance with his interpretation of ver. 13.

[3] Comp. Phil. iii. 7 ff.; 2 Cor. v. 15 ff.; 1 Cor. i. 23, ii. 2, *et al.*

[4] Vulgate, Erasmus, Beza, Luther, and many others, including de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler.

[5] ii. 19 f.; Rom. vi.

Holy Spirit. By this fellowship Paul is transplanted into an entirely new relation of life, and feels that all the previous interests of his life are now stripped of their influence over him, and that he is now completely independent of them.[1] — ἐμοί] *for me*, denotes the ethical reference of the relation. See Bernhardy, p. 84. — κόσμος[2] finds its explanation from ver. 15 (οὔτε περιτομὴ, οὔτε ἀκροβυστία), namely, *the organic totality of all relations aloof from Christianity*, looked upon, indeed, as a *living power*, which exercises authority and sway over the unconverted, but in the case of the converted has become *dead* through his admission into the fellowship of faith and life with the crucified Lord ; that is, has ceased to influence and determine his thoughts, feelings, and actions. Thus the world is crucified to him by means of the crucifixion of Christ.[3] — κἀγῶ τῷ κόσμῳ] for the cessation of the *mutual* fellowship of life is meant to be expressed, and the matter to be thus wholly exhausted.[4]

Ver. 15. Γάρ] introduces an explanatory reason assigned, not for the καυχᾶσθαι ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ,[5] which has already received its full explanation in the relative sentence δι' οὗ κ.τ.λ., but for the just expressed δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος κ.τ.λ. This relation of his to the world cannot indeed, according to the axiom οὔτε περιτομή κ.τ.λ., be other than that so expressed. In justification of this reference of γάρ, observe that περιτομή and ἀκροβυστία comprehend the *two categories of worldly relations apart from Christianity*, which had so prominently re-asserted themselves in those very Galatian disturbances (comp. v. 6). *For neither circumcision availeth, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature :*[6] that is, "for it is a matter of indifference whether one is circumcised or uncircumcised ; and the only matter of importance is, that one should be created anew, transferred into a new, spiritual condition of life." As to the form and idea of καινὴ κτίσις, see on 2 Cor. v. 17. As *characteristics* of the καινὴ κτίσις, we find, according to ii. 20, the ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός ; according to iii. 27, the "having put on Christ ;" according to v. 6, πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη ; according to Eph. ii. 10, the περιπατεῖν ἐν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς ; and according to 1 Cor. vii. 19, τήρησις ἐντολῶν Θεοῦ. In the new man (Col. iii. 10), Christ determines all things ; the new man is σύμφυτος τῆς ἀναστάσεως of Christ (Rom. vi. 5), set free by the Spirit from the law of sin and of death (Rom. viii. 2), a child and heir of God (Rom. viii. 16 f.). That this principle, moreover, was that of the *Christian* point of view, was self-evident to the reader ; without again adding ἐν Χριστῷ 'Ιησοῦ, as in v. 6 (see the critical remarks), Paul has rendered this Christian axiom the more striking by setting it down *in an absolute form*. It stands here as his concluding signal of triumph.

---

[1] Comp. Phil. iii. 7 ff.

[2] Without the article ; see Winer, p. 117.

[3] Comp. Col. ii. 20 ; Eph. ii. 2 f. ; 1 Cor. vii. 31, 33, 34 ; Jas. iv. 4 ; 1 John ii. 15 f.

[4] Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 13 ; 2 Thess. i. 12 ; "nec malis illius territor, nec commodis titillor, nec odium metuo, nec plausum moror, nec ignominiam formido, nec gloriam affecto," "I am neither terrified by its evils, nor gratified by its advantages, nor do I fear its hatred, nor do I care for its applause, nor dread its shame, nor grasp after its glory," Erasmus, *Paraphr.*

[5] Hofmann, Matthias, Reithmayr, and others.

[6] It is stated by Syncell. *Chron.* p. 27 (ed. Bonn, p. 48), and Phot. *Amphil.* 183, that Paul derived this utterance from the apocryphal *Apocalypsis Mosis.* It is possible that the same thought occurred in that book ; but it is certain that Paul derived it from his own inmost consciousness. It may have passed from our passage into the ἀποκάλυψις Μωϋσέως. Comp. Lücke, *Einl. in d. Offenb. Joh.* I. p. 232 f.

Ver. 16. The heart, full of the great truth in ver. 15, has now a wish of blessing for all who follow it in their conduct. The simple *and*, carrying on the train of thought and linking it with ver. 15, serves to express this wish. A reference to ver. 14, so as to connect our verse with the wish therein contained,[1] is not required by *καί*, and is forbidden by the importance of ver. 15, which would in that case have to be reduced to a mere parenthetical insertion. — The emphasis lies not on *τούτῳ*, but on *τῷ κανόνι* ;[2] for it is the very *canonical* character of the saying in ver. 15 which has to be brought out : "who shall walk according to the *guiding line*, which is herein given." We are prohibited from assigning to *κανών* the *non-literal* meaning *rule*, *maxim* (as is usually done ; see Schott *in loc.*), by the figurative *στοιχήσουσιν*, which requires the *literal* meaning *guiding line* (2 Cor. x. 13 ff.), that is, in this passage, *a line defining the direction of the way ;* as such, the maxim expressed in ver. 15 is *placed before* them. As to *στοιχεῖν*, comp. on v. 25. The *anacoluthic nominative* *ὅσοι κ.τ.λ.* has rhetorical emphasis, directing the whole attention of the readers first to the subject in itself which is under discussion.[3] The *future* *στοιχήσ.*[4] applies to the time of receiving the letter.[5] Paul hopes that the letter will have a converting and strengthening effect upon many readers, but makes the question, *who* should be warranted in applying to himself the concluding blessing, depend on the result. — *εἰρήνη ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεος*] *sc. εἴη*,[6] *welfare* (שלום [peace] ; see on Eph. vi. 23 ; John xiv. 27) *on them, and mercy* (Tittm. *Synon.* p. 69 f.). Comp. 1 Tim. i. 2 ; 2 Tim. i. 2 ; Jude 2 ; 2 John 3, in which passages *ἔλεος stands first.* Here it *follows after*, not because Paul intended at first to write *εἰρήνη* only,[7] nor because in *ἔλεος* he had specially in view the day of judgment,[8] which indeed is expressly added in 2 Tim. i. 18, but because he has *thought of* the effect produced before the producing cause. *What* welfare it is that Paul wishes—namely, all *Messianic* welfare—is obvious of itself. The peace of reconciliation *forms a part* of it. *ἔλεος* is, moreover, to be considered as *neuter*, because Paul *throughout* so uses it ;[9] although the neuter form, which very often occurs in the LXX., is but very rarely found in classical authors.[10] — In *ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς* is implied the idea that welfare and mercy *come down upon* them from heaven.[11] — *καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ Θεοῦ*] That this is a reminiscence of Ps. cxxv. 5, cxxviii. 6,[12] could only be assumed without dealing arbitrarily, if, instead of καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσρ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, Paul had written : εἰρήνη ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραήλ ! which, after the instruction given by him in iv. 21 ff., he *might* have written without any danger of misunderstanding. Still less can the expression be referred to Ps. lxxiii. 1 ; for which purpose Hofmann employs an impossible interpretation of the Hebrew text of the passage. The *Israel of God*, that is, as contrasted with Jacob's bodily descendants as such,[1] *the Israelites who belong to God as His own*, and therefore form the real people of God ideally viewed,[2] are at any rate *the true Christians.*[3] But according as καί is taken either as *explanatory* or as *conjunctive*, we may understand either the true Christians *in general*, *Jewish and Gentile Christians,*[4] or the truly converted *Jews.*[5] If we adopt the latter interpretation, we must either[6] refer the foregoing ὅσοι and αὐτούς to the Gentile Christians,—a view which is, however, decisively at variance with the universal ὅσοι, and with the description excluding any national reference, τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχ. —or[7] we must explain the train of thought as follows : "Salvation be upon all true Christians, *and more especially* (to mention these in particular ; see on Mark i. 5, xvi. 7) on all true Jewish Christians !" But however near Paul's fellow-countrymen were to his heart (Rom. ix. 1), he not only had no ground in the context for bringing them forward here so specially ; but any such distinction would even be quite improperly introduced—especially in the deeply-impassioned close of the letter—in presence of churches which consisted principally of Gentile Christians and had been involved by Jewish interference in violent controversies. And even apart from this, no reader to whom the teaching of the apostle as to the true Israelites was familiar[8] could think that τὸν Ἰσρ. τοῦ Θεοῦ referred to Jewish Christians *only ;* this would be opposed to the *specific* conception of Paul on this point. We must adhere, therefore, to the *explicative* view of καί as the *correct* one,[9] *and indeed, namely*, so that it introduces an appropriate, more precise description[10] of the subjects previously characterized. Hofmann is wrong in objecting that the *epexegetical* καί is always *climactic.*[11] Moreover, the designation of all those, who shall walk according to that entirely anti-Jewish rule of conduct, as *the Israelites of God*, forms as it were the final triumph of the whole epistle over the Judaistic practices, the very aim of which was to assert the title of the Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα to the heritage of salvation. Hofmann is entirely mistaken in his view that καί is *even*, and that the Israel of God are the *Jew-Christians*, so that Paul expresses the idea that he desired *to include even these* in his wish. It was, indeed, obvious that in ἐπ' αὐτούς they could *not* be, and were not intended to be, *excluded;* but Paul was neither so unwise nor so devoid of tact as expressly to state that self-evident point, as if there could possibly be any doubt about it. By adding this last word, he would only have offended the theocratical point of honor (Rom. i. 16). Lastly, Matthias also is wrong in supposing that καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσρ. τοῦ Θεοῦ begins the new sentence (ver. 17) : "*And concerning the Israel of God henceforth let no man,*" etc. This interpretation ought to have been prevented by the solemn repetition of the preposition, which indeed on the second occasion would acquire quite a different sense (*concerning*).

---

[1] Hofmann.

[2] Comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 19.

[3] Comp. on Matt. vii. 24, x. 14 ; John i. 12 ; Acts vii. 40.

[4] Comp. v. 10.

[5] Comp. *τοῦ λοιποῦ*, ver. 17.

[6] Taken as a *wish* of blessing, the thought harmonizes more naturally with the *conclusion* of the epistle, than if it is taken as an *affirmation* (de Wette, *ἔσται* or *ἐστίν*). Chrysostom and Theophylact appear to have supplied *ἔσται* ; but Theodoret takes it as *wish : ἐπηύξατο τὸν ἔλεον κ. τὴν εἰρήνην*, "He prays for mercy and peace."

[7] So, arbitrarily, Olshausen.

[8] Hofmann.

[9] Even in Tit. iii. 5 it is neuter, according to decisive testimony.

[10] See Dindorf, *ad Diod.* iii. 18 ; Kühner, I. p. 396, c. ed. 2.

[11] Comp. Luke ii. 25, 40, iv. 18 ; 2 Cor. xii. 9 ; Mark i. 10 ; Acts xix. 6, *et al.*

[12] Theophylact, Erasmus, and others ; also Rückert, Schott, de Wette, Reiche.

---

[1] Comp. Rom. ix. 6; 1 Cor. x. 18; Phil. iii. 3.

[2] Comp. also John i. 48.

[3] Not the *Jews* (Morus), nor even *the pious Jews*,—those, namely, who have not rejected the gospel out of stubbornness, and permit the hope of their coming to recognize the rule expressed in ver 15 (Reiche, p. 97 f.). The apostle, according to his whole system, could not understand under the ideal Israel of God any others than *believers* (iii. 7, 29, iv. 26 ; Rom. ix. 6–8). To him the καινὴ κτίσις in ver. 15 was not conceivable otherwise than as necessarily conditioned by *faith* (iii. 28 ; Eph. ii. 10) ; hence he could not expect of any Jew not yet converted, however pious he might be as an observer of the law, that he would walk according to the canon of ver. 15.

[4] Chrysostom, Theodoret, Luther, Calvin, Pareus, Cornelius à Lapide, Calovius, Baumgarten, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Borger, Winer, Paulus, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Wieseler, and others [Alford, Lightfoot].

[5] Ambrosiaster, Beza, Grotius, Estius, Schoettgen, Bengel, Rückert, Matthies, Schott, de Wette, Ewald, Reithmayr, and others [Ellicott, Eadie] ; Usteri does not decide.

[6] With Grotius, Schott, Bengel, Ewald.

[7] With Rückert, Matthies, de Wette, Reithmayr, and others.

[8] See iii. 7, iv. 21 ff.

[9] 1 Cor. iii. 5, viii. 12, xv. 38 ; John i. 16.

[10] Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 145 f.; Winer, p. 407.

[11] See Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 838.

Ver. 17. Τοῦ λοιποῦ] occurring only here in the N. T., very frequent in other authors ; not *ceterum*, "besides," so that it would be a *formula abrumpendi*, "*formula of transition*,"[1] equivalent to τὸ λοιπόν,[2] but the genitive *of time ;*[3] and that as denoting "*repetitionem ejusdem facti reliquo tempore*," "a repetition of the same deed in the time remaining."[4] The sense *posthac*, "after this," might also have been expressed by the *accusative;*[5] but in this case a *repetitio perpetua*, "constant repetition," would be meant.[6] Calvin explains : "*as for the rest*," *i.e.*, *praeter novam creaturam*, "beside, the new creature." Comp. Wieseler : "*quod restat*," "as to what remains." In this case, either the genitive would stand *absolutely :* "*as concerns what remains ;*"[7] or it would be dependent on κόπους. But, looking at the frequent use of τοῦ λοιποῦ as a particle of time, both these explanations would be very unnecessarily far-fetched. This remark also applies to the view of Hofmann, who strangely attaches τοῦ λοιποῦ, notwithstanding the want of an antithetical particle, as genitive of the object to κόπους, and conceives Ἰσραήλ as again supplied : *on account of the Israel, which is not the Israel of God.* Respecting *that* Israel, in the apostle's view, he has not to inquire whether it will be injured through the labor to which he is called. As if any such cold, remorseless renunciation could be justly attributed to the apostle who held his συγγενεῖς κατὰ σάρκα so painfully dear,[8] and strove in every possible way to gain them.[9] But from the hostile annoyances and vexations, which the reader would readily understand to be referred to in these words, the apostle desires to remain henceforward exempt ; and this he demands with apostolic sternness. —*ἐγὼ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.*] the emphasis is on *ἐγώ* : it is not the teachers who are hostile to me, these men afraid to suffer (ver. 12), but *I* who bear, etc. *στίγματα* [1] signifies *marks branded or etched in*, which, usually consisting of letters,[2] were put on the body (especially on the forehead and hands) in the case of slaves, as the device of their masters ;[3] of soldiers, as the badge of their general ; of criminals, as a sign of their offence ; and among some oriental nations also, as a token of the divinity which they worshipped.[4] Here Paul has had in view the marks borne by *slaves* :[5] for, according to the immediate context (vv. 14, 18), Christ is present to his mind as the *Lord ;* and also in 2 Cor. xi. 23 he discerns, in the ill treatment which he has suffered, the proof that he is *διάκονος Χριστοῦ*.[6] The *genitive* *Ἰησοῦ* denotes therefore the *Ruler*, whose servant Paul is indicated to be by his *στίγματα* ; and because in this case the feeling of fellowship with the concrete person of his Master has thoroughly pervaded him, he does not write *Χριστοῦ*, but *Ἰησοῦ*.[7] Others have explained: "notae corporis *tales, quales ipse Christus gestavit*," "such bodily marks as Christ himself bore ;"[8] but against this it may be urged that Paul has not made use of a word which of itself conveys a complete idea (such as *τὴν νέκρωσιν*, 2 Cor. iv. 10), but has used the significant *στίγματα*, which necessarily prompts the reader to ask *to whom* the person marked[9] is described *as belonging*. Therefore *Ἰησοῦ* is not[10] to be considered as the genitive of the *author*. —But what was it that Paul bore in his body as the *στίγματα Ἰησοῦ* ? *The scars and other traces of the wounds and mal-treatment, which he had received on account of his apostolic labors.*[11] For in *the service of Christ* he had been maltreated (2 Cor. xi. 23), and that so that he *must* have retained scars or similar indications.[12] Some expositors have, however, believed that

---

[1] Bengel, Zachariae, and others.

[2] 2 Cor. xiii. 11 ; Eph. vi. 10 ; Phil. iii. 1, *et al.*

[3] Kühner, II. p. 189) : *posthac, henceforward* (Xen. *Anab.* v. 7. 34, vi. 4. 11 ; Plat. *Legg.* vii. p. 816 D, *Demos.* p. 385 B ; Herod. ii. 109 ; and the passages in Wetstein.

[4] Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 706.

[5] τὸ λοιπόν, Matt. xxvi. 41 ; Mark xiv. 41 ; 1 Cor. vii. 29 ; Xen. *Anab.* ii. 2. 5, iii. 2. 8 ; Soph. *Trach.* 907, 917.

[6] Hermann, *l.c.* Comp. Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* ii. 2. 5.

[7] ὃ δὲ λοιπόν, 1 Cor. iv. 2, see Heind. *ad Charm.* p. 89 ; Matthiae, p. 815.

[8] Rom. ix. 1 ff., x. 1.

[9] 1 Cor. ix. 20.

---

[1] *στίγμα* is paroxytone ; see Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 406.

[2] Lev. xix. 28.

[3] In the *East ;* but among the Romans only in the case of slaves who were suspected or had run away (as a sign of the latter offence, they were by way of punishment branded with Φ or F. U. G.).

[4] 3 Macc. ii. 29 ; and Grimm *in loc.* See Wetstein, p. 237 f. ; Lipsius, *Elect.* ii. 15 ; Deyling, *Obss.* III. p. 423 ff. ; Spencer, *Legg. rit.* ii. 14. 1 ; Ewald, *in Apocal.* p. 151 f.

[5] Not of *soldiers*, as Grotius (comp. Calvin), and Potter, *Arch.* II. p. 7, think ; for this must have been suggested by the context. Wetstein understands *sacras notas*, "sacred marks" (Herod. ii. 113: *στίγματα ἱρά*), so that Paul represents Christ "*ut Deum*, quem *τὸν κύριον κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν* vocat," "as God, whom he calls pre-eminently the Lord." But these *sacrae notae* are only found among *particular* nations, such as the Persians and Assyrians (Plut. *Lucull.* p. 507 E ; Lucian, *de Dea Syra*, 59 ; comp. also what is related in Herod. ii. 113 about a temple of Hercules in Egypt, and in the *Asiatic Researches*, vii. p. 281 f., about the Indians); hence so foreign a custom would not be likely to suggest itself to the apostle, nor could it be understood by his readers without some more special indication.

[6] Comp. also Rev. vii. 3.

[7] Comp. on 2 Cor. iv. 10.

[8] Morus, comp. Borger.

[9] *στιγματίας*, also *στιγματοφόρος*, "bearing tatoo-marks," Lid. and Scott], Polyaen. *Strat.* i. 24.

[10] With Gomarus and Rückert.

[11] Not as Luther, 1519 and 1524, following Augustine, thought: the taming of the flesh and the fruits of the Spirit; against which the *ἐν τῷ σώματί μου* is itself decisive. In the Commentary of 1538, he understands "*plagas corpori suo impressas et passiones, deinde ignita tela diaboli, tristitiam et pavores animi*," "the blows and sufferings impressed upon his body, then too the fiery darts of the devil, and sorrow and fear of mind," which thus throws together very different elements outward and inward.

[12] See 2 Cor. xi. 24, 25.

Paul adduces these στίγματα by way of contrast to *the scar of circumcision*;[1] but this idea is arbitrarily introduced, and in its paltriness alien to the lofty self-consciousness which these words breathe.—Lastly, as regards *the sense in which the reference of* γάρ is to be taken, many expositors explain it, with Grotius: "*satis aliunde habeo, quod feram*," "I have enough from other quarters to bear." So, in substance, Vatablus, Bengel ("afflicto non est addenda afflictio," "affliction should not be added to affliction"), Morus, Winer. But what a feeble reason to assign would this be, either as fretful or as even bespeaking compassion, and wholly repugnant at all events to the proud feeling of being *marked* as the δοῦλος of Christ![2] And the ἐγώ, so full of self-consciousness in opposition to the false teachers, is inconsistent with this view. No; Paul means[3] to say: for *I* am one who, by being marked as the servant of Christ, is in possession of a *dignity*, which may justly exempt him from any repetition of molestations (such as had vexed him on the part of the Galatian churches).—On βαστάζω, comp. Chrysostom: οὐκ εἶπεν ἔχω, ἀλλὰ βαστάζω, ὥσπερ τις ἐπὶ τροπαίοις μέγα φρονῶν, "He does not say: 'I have,' but 'I bear,' as if highly regarding them as trophies."

Ver. 18. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ.] See on i. 6. — μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν] *sc.* εἴη. A special *design*, on account of which Paul did not write merely μεθ' ὑμῶν,[4] or μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν,[5] is indeed assumed by many expositors (that Paul desired once more to indicate that salvation does not come from the σάρξ),[6] but cannot be made good; especially as also in Philem. 25,[7] instead of the persons simply, we find that with greater significance and fervor the *spirit* of the persons (so also at the close of the Epistle of Barnabas) is named, because it is on the πνεῦμα of man (the higher principle of life with the νοῦς)[8] that the grace of Christ works,[9] when the Spirit of Christ takes up His abode in the human spirit and so confers His χαρίσματα. Paul *might* also have written μετὰ τῶνψυχῶν ὑμ., "with your souls;"[10] but even in that case the gracious operation of Christ would have to be conceived as issuing from the seat of self-consciousness (the πνεῦμα of man). — ἀδελφοί] The epistle, in great part so severe, ends with a mode of address which still breathes unaltered *love* (1 Cor. xvi. 24).

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

LXXIV. Ver. 6. ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς.

In support of the usual interpretation that refers this passage to the sharing of temporal goods, Eadie collects the following places where ἀγαθά has such meaning: Luke xii. 18, 19, xvi. 25; and in LXX., 2 Sam. vii. 28; 1 Chr. xvii.

---

[1] Erasmus in his *Annot.*, Beza, Schoettgen, Grotius; comp. Bengel and Michaelis.

[2] Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff.

[3] "Veluti trophaea quaedam ostentans," "as though displaying some trophies," Erasmus, *Paraphr.*

[4] 1 Cor. xvi. 23; Col. iv. 18; 1 Thess. v. 28.

[5] 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Phil. iv. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 18; Tit. iii. 15.

[6] Chrysostom, Theophylact, Beza, and others; also Rückert, Usteri, Schott, Olshausen.

[7] And 2 Tim. iv. 22.

[8] See on Luke i. 46; Rom. i. 4, viii. 10; 2 Cor. ii. 13, *et al.*

[9] Rom. viii. 10, 16.

[10] Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 15; 1 Pet. i. 9, 22, ii. 11, 25.

26 ; 2 Chr. xviii. 12, 17 ; and Lightfoot cites the Epistle of Barnabas, § 19: "Thou shalt communicate in all things with thy neighbor . . . for if ye are partakers in common of things which are incorruptible, how much more of those things which are corruptible." With this agrees the recently found "Teaching of the Apostles" (lines 92, 93) : "Thou shalt not turn away the needy, but shalt share (*συγκοινωνήσεις*) all things with thy brother."

LXXV. Ver. 7.

Eadie and Sieffert insist on the necessity of regarding this exhortation as intended to enforce the entire section from ver. 1, "treating of duties which spring out of love, the fruit of the Spirit, and which are themselves forms of spiritual beneficence or well-doing – duties, however, which one may be tempted to neglect, or regard only in a negative aspect."

LXXVI. Ver. 11. *πηλίκοις γράμμασιν.*

An analogy is found in the bold signature of John Hancock to the Declaration of Independence.

LXXVII. Ver. 12. *εὐπροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί.*

There is much force in Sieffert's exception that Meyer's interpretation is inconsistent with the only grammatical construction allowable here, viz., the qualification of the *εὐπρόσωπος* by *ἐν σαρκί.* Meyer's argument would require *ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες* or *σαρκικοὶ ὄντες.* Sieffert explains it as conveying the idea of the sphere of the external, with special reference to circumcision. This latter, on the other hand, seems too narrow. Ellicott interprets *ἐν σαρκὶ* as "the earthly existence and conditions of man ;" Alford, "in outward things which belong to man's natural state ;" Lightfoot, "in external rites ;" Eadie, "the unrenewed nature cropping out under its more special aspect of sensuousness and externalism." "They who wish to make a fair appearance, according to the standard of the unrenewed nature," seems to us to be the meaning.

LXXVIII. Ver. 14. *ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου.*

The Revised Version reads "through which," thus making the *σταυρῳ* the antecedent ; the marginal reading, however, is "whom." Meyer's construction is further supported by Ellicott, Alford, and Riddle, and antagonized by Schmoller, Lightfoot, Eadie, Sanday, and Sieffert. The latter claims that when Meyer says "by whom, *i.e.*, by whose crucifixion is produced the result," he virtually acknowledges that the context requires that the reference be to the cross ; and finds in it an excellent antithesis to the assumptions of the Judaizers who, from worldly motives, were unwilling to bear the consequences of the cross. On the other hand, both the immediate proximity of the *τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and the grandeur of Him whom it indicates, renders reference to a more remote antecedent very improbable. The question is purely grammatical. Either construction ultimately ends in the same idea. *σταυρὸς* is referred by some to the subjective cross, or the afflictions that attend devotion to Christ's cause, as in Rom. v. 3 ; but this is justified neither by the immediate context, cf. v. 12, nor by the argument which is to offset the trust in the law, by faith that finds its ground of salvation in nothing but the death of Christ.

TOPICAL INDEX.

A.

Abba, Father, 175 seq.
Abraham, his faith, 109 seq., 159 ; the promises to, 122 seq. ; his spiritual seed, 158 seq. ; his two sons, 200 seq.
Accountability, personal, 251 seq.
Advent, Second, of Christ, 13 seq., 38.
Angels and the law, 132, 160 seq.
Anathema, 18 seq., 39 ; justified, 20 seq.
Arabia, 29 seq., 40 seq.
Atonement, of Christ, 12 seq. ; vicarious, 116 seq., 172, 212 seq.

B.

Barnabas, 79.
Benedictions, 267 seq., 271.
Benevolence, Apostolic, 48, 74 seq. ; to believers, 258 seq.
Blessing, spiritual, 267 seq.
Bondage, Spiritual, 167 seq. ; ceremonial, 179 seq. ; warned against, 219 seq.

C.

Ceremonial observances, 180 seq.
Christ Jesus, His divinity, 9 ; subordinated to the Father, 9 seq., 37 seq. ; His atoning death, 12 seq., 38 seq., 172, 212 seq. ; His second advent, 13, 38; His active obedience, 85 seq., 97 ; our justification, 87 seq., 114 seq. ; and the law, 91 seq. ; His atoning love, 93 seq. ; becoming a curse for us, 116 seq. ; as the seed of Abraham, 124 seq., 160 ; as Mediator, 134 seq. ; His pre-existence, 170 seq. ; His incarnation, 171 seq.
Christianity, its sum and substance, 90 seq. ; and Judaism, 169 seq.
Church, The Christian, its collective opinion, 55 seq. ; triumphant, 207 seq.
Circumcision, in the Apostolic Church, 57 seq. ; and Christ, 220, 223 seq., 266 seq. ; and the law, 220 seq. ; going beyond, 231, 244 ; urged by the dissembling, 262 seq.
Communism, Christian, 253 seq., 271 seq.
Crucifying the flesh, 241 seq.

D.

Damascus, 24 ; Paul's sojourn at, 29 seq., 40 seq.
Days, Observance of, 180 seq.
Discrepancy, alleged, between Paul and Luke, 50 seq., 95.
Doxology, of Paul, 14.

E.

Election, Divine, 27.
Envy, illustrated, 190 seq.
Equality, Spiritual, in Christ, 158 seq.
Exclusiveness, Sectarian, 77 seq.

F.

Faith, working righteousness, 93 seq., 105 seq., 109, 159, 222 seq.; receiving salvation, 150 seq., 161 ; and baptism, 156 seq.; in love, 223 seq.
Fellowship, Christian, 73 seq., 96 ; in suffering, 248 seq.; in teaching, 252 seq.; with Christ, 265 seq., 272.
Festival Seasons, 180 seq.
Flesh, The, and the Spirit, 235 seq., 244 ; the fruits of, 238, 245.
Forbearance, mutual, 248 seq.
Forgiveness, 247 seq.
Fraternal union, 73 seq., 96.
Freedom, Christian, 62 seq., 95, 206 seq., 210 seq.; steadfastness in, 219 seq.; in love, 231 seq.; and the moral law, 237 seq., 244 seq.

G.

Galatia, 1 seq.
Galatians, The, 1 seq.; their churches, 2 seq.; their Judaizing teachers, 3 seq.; their fickleness, 15 ; receiving the Holy Spirit, 103 seq.; as sons of God, 155 seq.; welcoming Paul, 186

seq., 214 seq.; converted through Paul, 195 seq.; not always faithful, 224 seq.
Galatians, The Epistle to the, 2 seq.; occasion of its writing, 3 ; object of its writing, 4 ; its contents, 4 ; time of composition, 4 seq.; place of writing, 6 ; its genuineness, 7.
Gentiles, The, saved by Christ, 118 seq.
God, the Father, 10, 37 ; His decrees, 26 seq.; no respecter of persons, 68 ; His efficacy, 70 ; His promises, 122 seq.; His unity, 145 seq.; the knowledge of, 178 seq., 213 seq.
Good Works, 85 ; and the law, 89 seq.
Gospel, The, 16 ; its counterfeit, 17.
Grace of God, The, 94 seq.
Growth, Spiritual, 196.

H.

Hagar, and Sarah, 201 seq., 215 seq.
Harvest, Spiritual, 257.
Holy Spirit, The, received, 103 seq.; given unto believers, 175 seq., 213 ; in the Christian life, 235 seq., 242 ; and the flesh, 235 seq., 244 ; the fruits of, 239 seq.
Humility, enjoined, 249 seq.
Hypocrisy, Spiritual, 78 seq., 95.

I.

Imputation, 85.
Independence, Spiritual, 67 seq.
Inheritance, Law of, 177.

J.

James, the brother of Christ, 33 ; his Apostolic rank, 71 seq.
Jerusalem, The new, 206 seq.
Judaism, 169 seq.
Judaizing Teachers, 61 seq,, 96.
Justification by Faith, 53, 84 seq., 93 seq., 109, 159, 155 seq., 222 seq.; by the law, 113 seq., 221 seq.

K.

Knowledge of God, The, 178 seq., 213 seq.

L.

Law, The, not justifying, 83 seq., 111 seq.; and good works, 89 seq. ; and Christ, 91 seq.; not annulled, 94 seq.; does not annul the covenant, 120 seq.; its aim and object, 127 seq.; its promulgation, 130, 160 ; ordained through a Mediator, 133 seq.; and God's promises, 149 ; its captivity, 151 seq.; a schoolmaster, 154 seq.; read in the church services, 199 seq.; fulfilled in love, 232 seq.; and freedom, 237 seq., 244 seq.
Law of Inheritance, Jewish and Roman, 177.
Leaven, doctrinal, 226.
Legalism, Jewish, 81 seq.; its captivity, 151 seq.
Liberty, Christian, 62 seq., 95, 206 seq., 210 seq.; steadfast in, 219 seq.; in love, 231 seq.; and the moral law, 237 seq., 244 seq.
Life, moral, 92 ; in Christ, 92 seq., 98 ; in the Holy Spirit, 235 seq., 241 seq.
Love, in freedom, 231 seq..; as the royal law, 232 seq.

M.

Mary, the mother of Jesus, her virginity, 33, 41.
Mediator, The, of the law, 133 seq. ; as Christ, 134 seq.
Moses, and the Law, 130 seq. ; as a mediator, 140 seq.
Mount Sinai, 202 seq.

P.

Parousia, The, 13 seq., 38 ; before and after, 167.
Patience, in well-doing, 256 seq.
Paul, as founder of the Galatian churches, 2 seq. ; as an apostle of God, 9, 37 ; salutes the churches, 11 seq. ; pronounces a curse, 18 seq., 39 ; and justifies himself, 20 seq. ; relates his past experience, 23 seq. ; his sojourn in Damascus and in Arabia, 29 seq., 40 seq. ; his visit to Cephas in Jerusalem, 31 seq., 41 ; visits Syria and Silicia, 34 seq. ; preaches the faith of Christ, 36 seq. ; his second visit to Jerusalem, 43 seq., 95 ; receives revelations, 24 seq., 52 seq. ; his independence, 67 seq. ; as apostle to the Gentiles, 70 seq. ; his apostolic recognition, 73 ; resisting Peter, 75 seq. ; his bodily weakness, 184 seq. ; converting the Galatians, 195 seq. ; his tender appeal, 197 seq. ; persecuted by the Jews, 228 seq., 243 seq. ; preaching circumcision, 229 seq. ; his handwriting, 259 seq. ; glories in Christ, 265 seq., 272 ; blesses the believers, 267 seq. ; his scarred body, 269 seq. ; his parting salutation, 271.
Persuasion, Spiritual, 225.
Peter, 71 ; resisted by Paul, 75 seq.

Poor, The, care for, 48, 74 seq.
Prayer, to the Father, 175 seq.
Preaching, a divine calling, 28.
Pedestination, Divine, 166.
Promises of God, The, to Abraham, 122 seq. ; and the law, 149.
Prophecy fulfilled, 208 seq.

R.

Reaping, and sowing, 255 seq.
Recompense, Moral, 255 seq., 257.
Redemption, through Christ, 115 seq.
Regeneration, Spiritual, 266.
Revelations, of Paul, 24 seq., 52 seq.
Righteousness, by faith, 93 seq. 105 seq., 109, 159, 222 seq., 243.

S.

Salvation, in answer to faith, 150, 161 seq. ; through Christ, 155 seq.
Sarah and Hagar, 201 seq.
Self-glorification rebuked, 250 seq.
Selfishness rebuked, 248 seq.
Sin, and the law, 129 seq., 160.
Sonship of believers, 173 seq., 176 seq.
Sowing, and reaping, 255 seq.
Star-worship, 167 seq.
Strife, among Christians, 234 ; warned against, 242 seq.
Subordination, of Christ, 9 seq., 37 seq.
Suffering, Fellowship in, 248 seq.

T.

Titus, 57 seq.
Treviri, The, 1.
Truth, not hostile, 189 seq.

U.

Unity of God, The, 145 seq.

Z.

Zeal, impure, 190 seq. ; pure, 192.

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL

HAND-BOOK

TO THE

EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

BY
HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, TH.D.,
OBERCONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FOURTH EDITION OF THE GERMAN BY
REV. MAURICE J. EVANS, B.A.

THE TRANSLATION REVISED AND EDITED BY
WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

WITH A PREFACE, TRANSLATION OF REFERENCES, AND SUPPLEMENTARY
NOTES TO THE AMERICAN EDITION BY
HENRY E. JACOBS, D D.,
PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE EVANGELICAL
LUTHERAN CHURCH AT PHILADELPHIA, AND LATE PROFESSOR OF THE
GREEK LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, PENNSYLVANIA
COLLEGE, GETTYSBURG, PA.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY.
NEW YORK AND LONDON.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1884,
By FUNK & WAGNALLS,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D.C.

PREFATORY NOTE BY THE EDITOR.

I HAVE at length the pleasure of issuing the last volume of the English translation of Dr. Meyer's own part in the great work which bears his name, and of thereby completing an undertaking on which I have expended no small amount of time and labor at intervals for the last eight years. I am aware that I have taxed considerably the patience of the subscribers and of the publishers, but I felt it due to them, as well as to Dr. Meyer, who had entrusted me with the charge of seeing his work faithfully reproduced, that the work should be done with care rather than with haste.

The present volume has been translated with skill and judgment by Mr. Evans from the fourth edition of the German—the last form, in which this portion of the Commentary had the advantage of Meyer's own revision. A fifth edition has since appeared (in 1878), under the charge of Professor Woldemar Schmidt of Leipzig, in which he has treated the book in a way similar to that adopted by Dr. Weiss with the Commentary on Mark and Luke, although not altering it to an equal extent. It is difficult to see why he should have followed such a course, for he himself states that he "has never been able to approve the custom of allowing other hands to remodel the works of the departed." I have already expressed, in the prefatory note to the volume on Mark and Luke, the grounds on which I take exception to the plan so pursued, and I content myself with here referring to them as equally applicable in principle to the less important changes made by Dr. Schmidt. I find a striking corroboration of my remark as to the work manipulated by Dr. Weiss being "to a considerable extent a new book by another author, and from a standpoint in various respects different," in the judgment pronounced by Dr. Schürer, in a recent review (*Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 9th October, 1880), on the same editor's treatment of the Commentary on the Gospel of John, when, after mentioning various features of "complete independence" and "thorough remodelling," he states that the result of the whole is "an essentially new work." Dr. Schürer indicates approval of the course pursued; but it seems to me alike unfair to the memory of Meyer, and uncalled for under the circumstances. It is quite open to an editor to write a book of his own on the subject, or to append as much as he deems necessary to his author's text by way of addition and correction ; but it is *not* open to him thus to recast an epoch-making work of exegesis, and to retain for its altered shape the sanction of the author's name. At any rate, I have thought it right, so far as the English reader is concerned, to present, according to my promise, the work of Meyer, without addition or subtraction, in its latest and presumably best form as it left his hands.

I may add, that whatever care may have been bestowed on the revision of the Commentary by Dr. Schmidt has not apparently extended to the correction of the press, for many errors, which have been discovered and corrected by Mr. Evans and myself in preparing the translation, still disfigure the new edition of the German. It is, of course, extremely difficult to avoid such errors in a work of the kind ; and I have no doubt that, notwithstanding the care of the printers, to whose excellent arrangements I am much indebted, the reader may light on not a few mistakes, as concerns references, accents, and the like ; but, as Dr. Meyer was not a particularly good corrector of the press, I trust that the English edition may be found in that respect fully more accurate than the original.

In the General Preface prefixed to the first volume issued (ROMANS), I stated the grounds that had induced me to undertake the superintendence of the work, and the revision of the translation, in the interests of technical accuracy and of uniformity of rendering throughout. And in order that the subscribers may be assured that the promise therein implied has been fulfilled to the best of my ability, I think it right, in conclusion, to state for myself (and I believe that the same may be said for my friends Drs. Crombie and Stewart, who lent me their aid at a time when other work was pressing heavily upon me) that I have carefully read and compared every sentence of the translation in the ten volumes which I edited—collating it for the most part in MS., as well as subsequently on its passage through the press ; that I have not hesitated freely to make such changes on the work of the translators as seemed to me needful to meet the requirements which I had in view ; and that, under these circumstances, I alone am formally and finally responsible for the shape in which the Commentary appears. All concerned in the enterprise have much reason to be gratified by the favor with which it has been received. I have, indeed, seen some exception taken to the style, and to the frequent use of technical terms such as *telic*, *protasis*, and the like ; but our object was to translate the book into intelligible English, not to recast its literary form (which, as I have formerly explained, has suffered from the mode in which the author inserted his successive alterations and additions); and it is, from its very nature, destined mainly for ministers and students, who ought to be familiar with the import of those convenient technical terms.

At the close of the article by Dr. Schürer, of which I have spoken before, he asks leave to repeat an urgent wish which he had some years ago expressed, that "there might be appended to the introduction of each volume of the German Commentary a list of the exegetical literature." He does not seem to be aware that in the English edition this want has been supplied with considerable fulness. I shall be glad to place the lists—all of which were prepared by me, except that prefixed to the Gospel of John, for which I am indebted to Dr. Crombie—at the service (a few errors apart) of any future editors of the original.

WILLIAM P. DICKSON.

Glasgow College, *October*, 1880.

PREFACE OF THE AUTHOR.

SINCE the year 1859, when the third edition of this Commentary was issued, there has appeared hardly any contribution of scientific importance to the exposition of the Epistle to the Ephesians. The *Commentarius Criticus* of the late Dr. Reiche contains, doubtless, many good exegetical remarks; but they are subservient to his main aim, which is critical, and elucidate merely detached passages or expressions; while the Lectures of Bleek are very far from having the importance which has been justly recognized as belonging to the previous series of Lectures by him on the Synoptic Gospels.

But while thus, apart from various able discussions of particular passages, I was less directly stimulated by new literary apparatus to subject my work to revision, the labor itself was not thereby rendered the lighter. The *dies diem docet* could not but, in the case of a task so momentous, have its title fully conceded; and it will be found that I have sought to place much on a better and more complete footing, so as to do fuller justice to the great object of ascertaining thoroughly, clearly, and dispassionately the meaning of the Apostle's discourse. By this I do not understand the discovery of those fanciful illusions [*Phantasmagoricen*] that people call profound. For the latter there is assuredly little need in the case of Paul, who, with the true penetration characteristic of his views and ways of unfolding them, knows how to wield his gifts of discourse so that his meaning shall be clear and palpable and apt; and least of all in the case of this very Epistle, where the Christological teaching rises of itself to the utmost height and embraces heaven and earth. This distinctive character cannot be injured by the circumstance that the apostolic writing, *as a letter to the Ephesians*,—such as, according to the critically-attested address, it is and will remain,—continues to be, at all events, an enigmatical phenomenon, and its historical conceivableness in so far an open question. Its elevation above the changes and controversies of Christological formulae and modes of conception cannot be thereby affected, and its prominent position in the New Testament as at once a testimony and a test of the truth cannot, amid any such change and strife, be prejudicially endangered.

HANNOVER, 10*th Nov.* 1866.

EXEGETICAL LITERATURE OF THE EPISTLE

TO THE

EPHESIANS.

[For commentaries and collections of notes embracing the whole New Testament, see the list prefixed to the Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew; for those which treat of the Pauline, or Apostolic, Epistles generally, see that which is prefixed to the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. The following list includes only those expositions which relate to the Epistle to the Ephesians. Works mainly of a popular and practical character have, with a few exceptions, been excluded, as, however valuable they may be in themselves, they have but little affinity with the strictly exegetical character of the present work. Monographs on chapters or sections are generally noticed by Meyer *in loc.* The editions quoted are usually the earliest; *al.* appended denotes that the book has been more or less frequently reissued; † marks the date of the author's death; *c.* = *circa*, an approximation to it.]

[Barry, Alfred, Principal of King's College, London, and Canon of Westminster: The Epistle to the Ephesians, with commentary (Handy Commentary Series), edited by C. J. Ellicott, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol). 16⁰, London, Paris and New York.]

Battus (Bartholomaeus), † 1637, Prof. Theol. at Greifswald: Commentarius in Epistolam ad Ephesios. . . . 4⁰, Gryphisw. 1619.

Baumgarten (Sigmund Jakob), † 1757, Prof. Theol. at Halle. See Galatians.

Baumgarten-Crusius (Ludwig Friedrich Otto), † 1843, Prof. Theol. at Jena: Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Epheser. . . . Herausgegeben von Ernst Julius Kimmel. . . . 8⁰, Jena, 1847.

Bayne (Paul), † 1617, Minister at Cambridge: An entire commentary upon the whole Epistle . . . to the Ephesians. . . . 2⁰, Lond. 1643.

Bleek (Friedrich), † 1859, Prof. Theol. at Berlin: Vorlesungen über die Briefe an die Kolosser, den Philemon und die Epheser. . . . 8⁰, Berl. 1865.

Bodius. See Boyd.

Boyd (Robert) of Trochrig, † 1627, Principal at Glasgow and Edinburgh: in Epistolam ad Ephesios praelectiones supra cc. . . . 2⁰, Lond. 1652, *al.*

Braune (Karl), Superintendent in Altenburg: Die Briefe S. Pauli an die Epheser, Kolosser, Philipper. Theologisch-homiletisch bearbeitet. [Lange's Bibelwerk.] 8⁰, Bielefeld, 1867.
Translated from the German, with additions [Ephesians], by M. B. Riddle, D.D. 8⁰, New York, 1870.

Bucer (Martin), † 1551, Prof. Theol. at Cambridge: Praelectiones in Epistolam ad Ephesios habitae Cantabrigiae . . . in lucem editae diligentia Im. Tremellii. 2⁰, Basil. 1562.

Chandler (Samuel), D.D., † 1766, Presbyterian Minister in London. [See Galatians.]
Cramer (Johann Andreas), † 1788, Prof. Theol. at Kiel: Neue Uebersetzung des Briefs an die Epheser, nebst einer Auslegung desselben. 4^0, Hamb. 1782.
Crocius (Johann), † 1659, Prof. Theol. at Marburg: Commentarius in Epistolam ad Ephesios. 8^0, Cassellis, 1642.

Davies (John Llewelyn), Rector of Christ Church, Marylebone. See Philippians and Colossians.
Dinant (Petrus), † 1724, Minister at Rotterdam: De Brief aan die van Efeze verklaart en toegepast. 4^0, Rotterd. 1711, *al.*

Eadie (John), D.D., † 1876, Prof. Bibl. Lit. to the United Presbyterian Church: A commentary on the Greek text of the Epistle to the Ephesians. 8^0, Lond. and Glasg. 1854.
Ellicott (Charles John), D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol: A critical and grammatical commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. 8^0, Lond. 1855, *al.*
Esmarch (Heinrich Peter Christian), † 1831, Rector at Schleswig: Brief an die Epheser übersetzt. 8^0, Altona, 1785.
Ewald (Georg Heinrich August), † 1876, Prof. Or. Lang. at Göttingen: Sieben Sendschreiben des Neuen Bundes uebersetzt und erklärt. [Sendschreiben an die Heidenchristen (die Epheser).] 8^0, Götting. 1870.

Ferguson (James), † *c.* 1670, Minister of Kilwinning. See Galatians.
Flatt (Johann Friedrich von), † 1821, Prof. Theol. at Tübingen. See Galatians.

Gude (Gottlob Friedrich), † 1756, Pastor at Lauban: Gründliche Erläuterung des lehrreichen Briefes an die Epheser. 8^0, Lauban, 1735.

Hagenbach (Karl Rudolph), † 1874, Prof. Theol. at Basel: Pauli Epistolam ad Philemonem interpretatus est C. R. Hagenbach. 4^0, Basil. 1829.
Harless (Gottlieb Christoph Adolf von), † 1879, President of the Consistory at Münich: Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Epheser. 8^0, Erlang. 1834, *al.*
Heinrichs (Johann Heinrich), Superintendent at Burgdorf. See Koppe (Johann Benjamin).
Hodge (Charles), D.D., † 1878, Prof. Theol. at Princeton: A commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians. 8^0, New York, 1856, *al.*
Hofmann (Johann Christian Konrad von), † 1877, Prof. Theol. at Erlangen: Die heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht. Theil iv. 1. Der Brief Pauli an die Epheser. iv. 2. Die Briefe an die Kolosser und an Philemon. 8^0, Nördlingen, 1870.
Holtzmann (Heinrich Johann), Prof. Theol. in Strassburg: Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosser-Briefe. . . . 8^0, Leip. 1872.
Holzhausen (Friedrich August): Der Brief an die Epheser übersetzt und erklärt. 8^0, Hannov. 1833.

Köhler (C. N.): Auslegung der Epistel Pauli an die Epheser. 8^0, Kiel, 1854.
Koppe (Johann Benjamin), † 1791, Superintendent at Gotha: Novum Testamentum Graece perpetua annotatione illustratum. Voll. i.–iv. 8^0, Götting. 1778–83. [Vol. vi. Epp. ad Galatas, Ephesios, Thessalonicenses. Editio tertia emendata et aucta. Curavit H. Chr. Tychsen.
Krause (Friedrich August Wilhelm), † 1827, Private Tutor at Vienna: Der Brief an die Epheser übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen begleitet. 8^0, Frankf. a. M. 1789.

Lagus (Daniel), † 1678, Prof. Math. at Greifswald : Commentatio quadripartita super Epistolam ad Ephesios. 4⁰, Gryphisw. 1664.

Lightfoot (Joseph Barber), D.D., Bishop of Durham. See Philippians and Colossians.

Locke (John), † 1704. See Galatians.

Luther (Martin), † 1546, Reformer : Die Epistel an die Epheser ausgelegt, aus seinen Schriften herausgegeben von Chr. G. Eberle. 8⁰, Stuttg. 1878.

Major [Mayer] (Georg), † 1574, Prof. Theol. at Wittenberg : Enarratio Epistolae Paulii scriptae ad Ephesios. 8⁰, Vitemb. 1552.

Matthies (Conrad Stephan), Prof. Theol. at Greifswald : Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Epheser. . . . 8⁰, Greifsw. 1834.

Meier (Friedrich Karl), † 1841, Prof. Theol. at Giessen : Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Epheser. 8⁰, Berl. 1834.

Morus (Samuel Friedrich Nathanael), † 1792, Prof. Theol. at Leipzig. See Galatians.

Musculus [Meusslin] (Wolfgang), † 1573, Prof. Theol. at Berne. See Galatians.

Passavant (Theophilus) : Versuch einer praktischen Auslegung des Briefes Pauli an die Epheser. 8⁰, Basel, 1836.

Popp (G. C.) : Uebersetzung und Erklärung der drei ersten Kapitel des Briefs an die Epheser, nebst einer kurzen Einleitung. . . . 4⁰, Rostock, 1799.

Roell (Herman Alexander), † 1718, Prof. Theol. at Utrecht : Commentarius in principium Epistolae ad Ephesios. 4⁰, Traj. ad Rhen. 1715. Et commentarii . . . pars altera, cum brevi Epistolae ad Colossenses exegesi. Ed. Dion. And. Roell. 4⁰, Traj. ad Rhen. 1731.

Rollock (Robert), † 1598, Principal of the University of Edinburgh : In Epistolam Pauli ad Ephesios commentarius. 4⁰, Edin. 1590, *al.*

Royaards (Albertus) : . . . Paullus' Brief aan de Ephesers schriftmatig verklaart. 3 deelen. 4°, Amsterd. 1735–38.

Rückert (Leopold Immanuel), † *c.* 1845, Prof. Theol. at Jena : Der Brief Pauli an die Epheser erläutert und vertheidigt. 8⁰, Leip. 1834.

Schenkel (Daniel), Prof. Theol. at Heidelberg : Die Briefe an die Epheser, Philipper, Colosser. Theologisch-homiletisch bearbeitet. [Lange's Bibelwerk, IX.] 8⁰, Bielefeld, 1862.

Schmid (Sebastian), † 1696, Prof. Theol. at Strassburg : Paraphrasis super Epistolam ad Ephesios. 4⁰, Strassb. 1684, *al.*

Schnappinger (Bonifacius Martin Wunibald), † *c.* 1825, Prof. at Heidelberg : Brief an die Epheser erklärt und erläutert von Bonifaz vom heil. Wunibald. 4⁰, Heidelb. 1793.

Schütze (Theodor Johann Abraham), † 1830, Director of the Gymnasium at Gera : Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Ephesios. 8⁰, Leip. 1778.

Spener (Philip Jakob), † 1705, Consistorial-Rath at Berlin : Erklärung der Episteln an die Epheser und Colosser. . . . 4⁰, Halae, 1706, *al.*

Stevart (Peter), † 1621, Prof. Theol. at Ingolstadt : Commentarius in Epistolam ad Ephesios. 4⁰, Ingolstad. 1593.

Stier (Rudolph Ewald), † 1862, Superintendent in Eisleben : Die Gemeinde in Christo. Auslegung des Briefes an die Epheser. 8⁰, Berl. 1848–49.

Til (Salomon von), † 1713, Prof. Theol. at Leyden. See Romans.

Turner (Samuel Hulbeart), D.D., † 1861, Prof. of Bibl. Interpretation at New York : The Epistle to the Ephesians in Greek and English, with an analysis and exegetical commentary. 8°, New York, 1856.

Tychsen (Thomas Christian), † 1834. See Koppe (Johann Benjamin).

VATABLUS [VASTEBLED] (François), † 1547, Prof. Heb. at Paris : Annotationes in Novum Testamentum. [Critici Sacri.]

WELLER (Hieronymus), † 1572, Superintendent at Freiberg : Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Ephesios. 8⁰, Noriberg, 1559.
WIESINGER (J. C. August). See PHILIPPIANS.

ZACHARIAE (Gotthilf Traugott), † 1777, Prof. Theol. at Kiel. See GALATIANS.
ZANCHIUS (Hieronymus), † 1590, Prof. Theol. at Heidelberg : Commentarius in Epistolam ad Ephesios. 2⁰, Neostadii, 1594.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

SEC. 1.—READERS TO WHOM THE EPISTLE IS ADDRESSED.

AT Ephesus, the capital of proconsular Asia, a flourishing abode of commerce, arts, and sciences, and the seat of the world-renowned worship of Artemis,—which, formerly one of the principal settlements of the Ionian population, has, since its destruction by the Goths, had its site marked only by gloomy ruins, and now by the small village of Ajasaluk, or, according to Fellows, Asalook,[1]—Paul planted Christianity (Acts xviii. 19, xix. 1, etc.); and his successful labors there, during a period of nearly three years, placed him in the close confidential relations to the church, of which his touching farewell to the elders (Acts xx. 17 ff.) is an imperishable memorial. The *church* was in its foundation a *mixed* one, composed of Jewish and Gentile Christians (Acts xix. 1–10, xx. 21); but at the later date, when our Epistle was composed, the *Gentile*-Christian element, which already appears from Acts xix. 26 extensively diffused, so greatly preponderated, that Paul could address the church *a potiori* as a *Gentile-Christian* one; see i. 12 f., ii. 1 ff., 11, 19, iv. 17, iii. 1. Hence it must not be inferred from this, that the Epistle could not have been addressed to the Ephesian church.[2]

Our Epistle is expressly addressed, in i. 1, *to the Christians at Ephesus.*[3] For the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ are so decisively attested, that they cannot be deprived of their right to a place in the text, either by isolated counter-witnesses, or by the internal grounds of doubt as to the Ephesian destination of the Epistle. Among the *manuscripts*, ℵ has ἐν Ἐφέσῳ only from the hand of a later corrector; B has the words only in the margin, and (notwithstanding Hug, *de antiq. Cod. Vat.* p. 26) *not* from the first hand;[4]

---

[1] See, generally, Creuzer, *Symbol.* II. p. 113 ff.; Pococke, *Morgenl.* III. p. 66 ff.; von Schubert, *Reise in das Morgenl.* I. p. 284 ff.; Guhl, *Ephesiaca*, Berol. 1842; Fellows, *Journal written during an Excursion in Asia Minor*, London, 1838, p. 274 f. [See also *Discoveries at Ephesus*, by J. T. Wood, who discovered the site of the Temple of Artemis in 1869.—Ed.]

[2] Reiche, Bleek, and others.

[3] See Lünemann, *de ep. ad Eph. authentiâ*, etc., 1842; Anger, *über d. Laodicenerbrief* (*Beitr. z. Einl. in's N. T.* I.), 1843. Reiche, in his *Comment. crit. in N. T.* II. 1859, has the most fully and thoroughly *controverted* the view of the Epistle being destined for Ephesus, and the genuineness of the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. Comp. also Weiss in Herzog's *Encykl.* XIX. *s.v.* "Epheserbrief."

[4] See Tischendorf in the *allg. K.-Zeit.* 1843, No. 116, and in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1847, p. 133.

while in the Cod. 67, proceeding from the twelfth century,[1] it was placed certainly in the text by the first hand, but was deleted by a second hand (which betrays generally an affinity with B). The evidence of the *versions* is unanimous for ἐν Ἐφέσῳ; but in the *Fathers* we find undeniable indications that the omission in B ℵ*, and the deletion in Cod. 67, are founded upon older codices, and have arisen out of critical grounds. For Basil the Great, *contra Eunom.* ii. 19,[2] says: *τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλων ὡς γνησίως ἡνωμένοις τῷ ὄντι*, "writing to the Ephesians as being united truly by knowledge to Him who is" (that is, *to Him who is existent*, in the absolute sense) *δι' ἐπιγνώσεως, ὄντας αὐτοὺς ἰδιαζόντως ὠνόμασεν εἰπών· τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδώκασι, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαίοις τῶν ἀντιγραφῶν εὑρήκαμεν*, "he calls them in a special sense *those who are*, saying, To the saints *τοῖς οὖσι* and the faithful in Christ Jesus. For thus those before us have transmitted it, and we have found it in the ancient copies." From this passage it is clear that Basil considered it indeed certain that the Epistle was written to the Ephesians, but looked upon the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ as non-genuine, to which conclusion he had been led not merely by way of tradition, but also through the old MSS. existing in his time, which he had himself looked into, and which had not ἐν Ἐφέσῳ.[3] It has, however, been incorrectly asserted that Jerome also did not find ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in MSS., but knew it merely as a conjecture.[4] He says, namely, on i. 1:[5] *Quidam curiosius, quam necesse est, putant ex eo, quod Moysi dictum sit*, "Some, with an excessive refinement, think from what was said to Moses" [Ex. iii. 14]: *haec dices filiis Israel: qui est misit me, etiam eos, qui Ephesi sunt sancti et fidelis, essentiae vocabulo nuncupatos.*[6] . . .

---

[1] According to others, including Reiche (*Comm. crit.* p. 102), even from the ninth or tenth century; but not from the year 1331, as Credner, *Einl.* I. 2, p. 397, states. This year belongs to *the* Codex 67, which contains the Acts and Catholic Epistles. See Griesbach, II. p. xv.; Scholz, II. p. x.

[2] *Opp.* ed. Garnier, I. p. 254.

[3] We must candidly recognize this as the result of the words of Basil. It is a partisan and mistaken view to assert that, in making the above quotation of the address of our Epistle, he had not included ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, because he had previously said τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλων, and that his appeal to tradition and the old MSS. applied only to the article τοῖς before οὖσιν (l'Enfant, Wolf), or to οὖσιν (Wiggers in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1841, p. 423 f.). In opposition to l'Enfant, it may be urged that Basil must necessarily have written τοὺς ὄντας previously, because the genuineness and the stress of the article (which is still wanting in Cod. 46) would have been in question; in opposition to Wiggers, that not the slightest critical trace of a previous omission of οὖσιν is to be found; while, against both, we may urge the decisive consideration, that it is in the highest degree arbitrary to assume that in the case of a verbal critical citation, such as Basil here gives with so earnest and emphatic a statement of his reason for doing so (οὕτω γὰρ κ.τ.λ.), words were passed over, because they would be obvious of themselves, and words, too, which were so far from being unimportant, that in fact it was only their absence that could warrant the metaphysical explanation of τοῖς οὖσιν, and did beyond doubt give rise to it. And if Basil were concerned only with τοῖς or οὖσιν, why, then, has he not merely cited the passage as far as οὖσιν, but also added the καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χ. Ἰ., so unimportant for that metaphysical conception of τοῖς οὖσιν, and—strangest of all—omitted just the ἐν Ἐφέσῳ which stood between? An inconceivable parsimony! No; no reader could understand the οὕτω γὰρ κ.τ.λ. otherwise than of the form of address just *literally* cited in the τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χ.,' Ι., from which the recension which was then current *differed*, in that it contained ἐν Ἐφέσῳ.

[4] Böttger, *Beitr.* 3, p. 37; Olshausen.

[5] *Opp.* ed. Vallars. VII. p. 545.

[6] Probably (see the scholion from Origen in Tischendorf) this explanation proceeded

Alii vero simpliciter non ad eos, qui sint, sed qui Ephesi sancti et fideles sint, scriptam arbitrantur, "These words shalt thou say to the children of Israel, He who is hath sent me, that the saints and faithful at Ephesus are addressed by a term descriptive of essence. Others, indeed, suppose that the epistle was written not simply to those who are, but to those who are at Ephesus, saints and faithful." But this "*scriptam arbitrantur*," "they thought it written," does not refer to the fact that these "*alii*," "others," had thought that the readers of the Epistle were the Ephesians; to Jerome, on the contrary, ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is quite an undoubted part of the text (*sanctis omnibus, qui sunt Ephesi,* "to all saints who are at Ephesus," is his reading), and he only adduces two different explanations of τοῖς οὖσιν, by which, however, ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is not affected. According to the one interpretation, the Christians at Ephesus were designated as *existing* in the metaphysical sense; according to the other, τοῖς οὖσιν was taken in the usual simple sense of εἶναι, and consequently the Epistle was regarded as directed not to the *existent* Ephesian Christians, but to the Christians *who were to be found at Ephesus.* Thus Jerome has not mentioned the omission of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, and therefore probably was not aware that the opinion of those "*quidam*" had originated from the very reading *without* ἐν Ἐφέσῳ; on which account he looked upon this opinion as a *curiosity.* Hence he furnishes, almost contemporaneously with Basil, an important counterpoise to his testimony. But if Basil in his time stands alone, he has a precursor, whose testimony points back to a considerably greater antiquity, in Tertullian, who says, *contra Marc.* v. 11: "*Praetereo hic et de alia epistola, quam nos ad Ephesios praescriptam*[1] *habemus, haeretici vero ad Laodicenos,* "I pass by here another epistle, which we have, addressed to the Ephesians, but the heretics to the Laodiceans;" and at ver. 17: "*Ecclesiae quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos, sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit,* "According to the true testimony of the church, we hold this epistle to have been sent to the Ephesians, not to the Laodiceans. But Marcion had sometimes a strong desire to interpolate the title" (*i.e.*, to make it otherwise, alter it), *quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator; nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes apostolus scripserit, dum ad quosdam,* "as if in that he had been a very diligent inquirer; but the question of the title is of no account, since the apostle wrote to all, when he wrote to some." According to this, in Tertullian's time the Epistle was acknowledged by the orthodox church, and by Tertullian himself,[2] as an Epistle to the Ephesians,

---

from Origen, since it looks quite like him, and he wrote a commentary on the Epistle, which was used by Jerome.

[1] That is, *superscribed.* Comp. for example, Gellius, v. 21, "*epistola . . . cui titulus praescriptus est,*" "the epistle to which the title is prefixed." The words "*ad Ephesios,*" "to the Ephesians," and "*ad Laodicenos,*" "to the Laodiceans," are the "ipsissima verba," "very words," of the prefixed *titulus praescriptus.* Hence *titulus,* "title," and *praescribere,* "prefixed," are not to be referred to the address and salutation, which are, in fact, an integral part of the epistolary text itself (against Harless, Lünemann, and others, and Laurent in the *Jahrb. für Deutsche Theol.* 1866, p. 131). See also Reiche, *Comment. crit.* p. 109. The reading *perscriptam* in the above passage of Tertullian has evidently arisen from *praescriptam* (which is contained in the editions of Pamela and Rigaltius) not having been understood.

[2] Comp. *cont. Marc.* iv. 5, *de praescrip. haer.* 36.

and only heretics like Marcion regarded it as addressed to the Laodiceans; but Tertullian cannot have read or known of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, i. 1, because otherwise he would not have spoken merely of a change in the *superscription*,[1] and would not have appealed to the "*veritas ecclesiae*," "truth of the church," but to the *text*. It has been objected, indeed (see especially, Harless and Wiggers, and compare also Lünemann), that this is an inference from the critical standpoint of *our* time, and that it would have been quite natural in Tertullian summarily to bring in the "*veritas ecclesiae*," "truth of the church." But this would only have been natural for him *in the event* of the question relating to a falsification of the *text* by Marcion. The question here concerns a falsification of the title, which, if the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ had stood in the text, would have been *at variance with the text;* and what would have been in that case more natural than to appeal to the apostolic ἐν Ἐφέσῳ? The invocation of the "*veritas ecclesiae*" serves precisely to prove that an apostolic ἐν Ἐφέσῳ was not known to Tertullian. This at the same time applies in opposition to the remark of Wiggers, I. 1, p. 429, that Marcion could not have read anything else than ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the address, if he had discovered anything to be changed in the superscription, which was naturally (?) of the same tenor (ἡ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἐπιστολή). No, he not merely may, but must have read in the address *nothing at all* of the place for which the Epistle was destined; otherwise he must have falsified the *address* also, and not merely the traditional *superscription*—which is not to be assumed, since Tertullian brings a charge against him merely as concerns the *titulus*, "title," and, on his own part, betrays no knowledge whatever of an ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the address. How, then, could Tertullian dismiss the falsification of Marcion with the evasive *nihil autem de titulis interest cum ad omnes*, "the question of titles is of no account," etc., if he had before him in the apostolic text ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, before which the title πρὸς Λαοδικέας would at once have broken down? Little as it fell in with Tertullian's purpose to assail Marcion at length on account of his falsification of the title, since he was occupied in confuting his dogmatic errors, surely it would have required no more words to dispose of the falsifier of the title by an appeal to the text, than to get rid of the matter with the superficial *nihil autem de titulis*, etc. And how could Marcion himself (evidently on the ground of Col. iv. 16) have hit upon the idea of changing the title of the Epistle, if he himself had read ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in i. 1? Dogmatic reasons, which at other times determined the heretic in his critical proceedings, did not exist here at all. If, in accordance with all this, the testimony of Tertullian, as well as the procedure of Marcion, to which he bears witness, is *adverse* to the ἐν Ἐφέσῳ; that, on the other hand, of Ignatius, *ad Eph.* 12, is not to be used either *for* or *against*, whether we look at his words in the shorter or the longer recension.[2]

---

[1] *Praescriptam, titulum;* comp. on this last, *de pudic.* 29, *al.*

[2] According to the *longer* recension (in Dressel, p. 332): Ὑμεῖς δὲ Παύλου συμμύσται ἐστέ ἡγιασμένου, μεμαρτυρημένου . . . ὃς πάντοτε ἐν ταῖς δεήσεσιν αὐτοῦ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν (vulg. ἡμῶν), "ye are initiated into the mysteries of the gospel with Paul the holy, the martyred, who is always mindful of you (vulg. of us) in his

But although, when the matter is thus cleared up, Basil on the ground of older MSS. rejected ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, and Marcion and Tertullian did not read the words, they are yet to be most decidedly retained as original, for the following external and internal reasons (in addition to the attestation, upon which we have already remarked, of all other still extant witnesses, and especially of the versions) :—(1) The entire ancient church has designated our Epistle expressly as *Epistle to the Ephesians* (Irenaeus, *Haer.* v. 2, 3 ; Clemens Alex. *Strom.* iv. 8, p. 592, ed. Potter ; Tertullian, Origen, and others, even as early as the *Canon Murat.*, and Valentinus in the *Philosoph. Or.* vi. 34) without even a single voice, with the exception of Marcion's, being raised against this view. But if the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ had been wanting *from the outset*, and the Epistle had thus borne on the face of it *no* place of destination, such a consensus would have been quite as inexplicable in itself as at variance with the analogy of the other Epistles, in which throughout the judgment of the church as to the first readers coincides with the superscription, where there is one, and beyond doubt depends upon it. (2) In all his Epistles Paul designates in the address the recipients most definitely, even when he does not write to the Christians of a single town (1 Cor. i. 2 ; 2 Cor. i. 1), or to a single church (Gal. i. 2). Accordingly, our Epistle, if fairly regarded in accordance with the address, should ἐν Ἐφέσῳ not be genuine, would be marked out as a *catholic* one, without any limitation whatever of locality or nationality of the readers,—a view with which the contents (i. 15, ii. 11, iii. 1, iv. 17, etc.) as well as the mission of Tychicus (vi. 21) would be decidedly at variance. (3) *On each occasion*, when St. Paul in the address has used τοῖς οὖσιν, it serves to specify the locality of the readers. See Rom. i. 7 : τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ; Phil. i. 1 : τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλίπποις ; 1 Cor. i. 2 : τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, and even so 2 Cor. i. 1. Compare the addresses in the Ignatian Epistles. (4) If Paul had written τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν καὶ πιστοῖς, we should have a form of address, which does not even admit of any tolerable explanation. It would yield the meaning : *to the saints, who are also* (not merely saints, but also) *believing.*[1] But what a flat and inappropriate severance of the ideas "*saints and believing,*" which should rather be conjoined into *unity* (comp. Col. i. 2) ! With the apostle there are no saints, who are *not* also

---

prayers." Following the reading ἡμῶν, Credner here concludes that our Epistle was not directed to the Ephesians alone. But it would apply to "*the Pauline Christians in general,*" so that it would not at all contain a reference to the *individual* Epistle. According to the *shorter* recension, the passage runs thus : Παύλου κ.τ.λ., ὃς ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν, "of Paul, who in every epistle admonishes you." Here ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῃ does not mean, *in the whole Epistle,*—a linguistically erroneous interpretation which, though still defended by Harless and repeated by Dressel, would yield a quite irrelevant meaning ; for how strange to say to A, who has received a letter from B : B makes mention of you in his whole letter ! This is surely obvious of itself, and is not at all a point appropriate to be dwelt upon ! On the contrary, ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ means : *in every Epistle ;* so that Ignatius does not mean our Epistle alone, nor yet by ὑμῶν specially the Ephesians as such, but the Ephesians *as Pauline Christians generally* (as regards category), and hence could say : *he makes mention of you in every Epistle.* It is not difficult to see how, in the words under consideration, the longer recension is related as *explanatory* to the shorter.

[1] It is not necessary that in this case οὖσιν should stand *after* πιστοῖς. Comp. John i. 49, iv. 9 ; Acts vii. 2 ; Eph. ii. 1, etc.

believers. The explanation of Meier is chargeable with the same inappropriateness : *to the saints, who are also faithful* (since the unfaithful have ceased to be saints) ; and, moreover, it is to be taken into consideration that πιστοῖς is not defined to have the sense of *faithful* by the context, but rather, when used in the address, and connected with ἐν Χ. Ἰ., most naturally presents the sense of *believing*, as in Col. i. 2.[1] Credner, *Einl.* I. 2, p. 400, translates : *to the saints, who are in fact also believers*, and this is held to mean : to the saints, who are true believers ; in the mouth of Paul equivalent to *Pauline Christians.* But, in this case, τοῖς οὖσιν could not, without risk of being misapprehended, dispense with a defining addition (*in fact*), or Paul at least must have written τοῖς καὶ οὖσιν πιστοῖς, in which case by means of καί the special emphasis of οὖσιν might be indicated (who are not merely *called* believers, but also *are* so). Yet even thus the expression would not be clear, and the meaning : *to the Pauline Christians*, would be purely imported. In a *context*, where Pauline and anti-Pauline Christians were spoken of, the reader might without further indication understand under true believers the former ; but not in the *address*, where this reference is not suggested by anything, and the less so, seeing that this contrast does not come once under discussion in the Epistle itself. Schneckenburger and Matthies attach τοῖς οὖσιν to τοῖς ἁγίοις. The latter[2] explains: τοῖς οὖσιν, *who are there* (namely, *in Asia Minor*, whither Tychicus was journeying to visit them), which imputes to Paul a strange clumsiness. But Schneckenburger[3] renders : *to the saints, who are in fact such.* But even thus Paul, in order to obviate misunderstanding (and in the *address* of an official writing at any rate people express themselves definitely and clearly), could not have dispensed with some defining adjunct (*in fact*) to τοῖς οὖσιν ; and, even apart from this, how unsuitable would the address be, whether we explain the true saints as standing in contrast to the nominal Christians or to the Jews ! The former would yield an *indefinite* designation of the readers, and would contain an exclusion and separation unsuited to the apostolic spirit and working. And the latter would be quite out of place, since the Epistle has nothing at all to do with the contrast to Judaism. All explanations *without* ἐν Ἐφέσῳ are fanciful impossibilities, unless we keep to the first-given simple translation of the words. Weiss does this in Herzog's *Encykl.* XIX. p. 480 ; rejecting ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, he makes *the saints, who are believers also on Christ*,[4] to be said of the *New Testament* saints in contrast with those of the *Old Testament.* But this contrast would itself be quite without any motive in the contents of the Epistle ; indeed, in the καί (*also*) there would be implied a side-glance at the *unconverted* Jews, which would be out of place and unsuitable.

---

[1] This also holds in opposition to Böttger's views, *Beiträge*, 3, p. 29 ff. : to the saints, who there *are* also faithful, in which the οὖσιν presents a contrast to the apostate Jewish-Christians, who *had been* faithful. Such a contrast would necessarily, from the very nature of the case, have been spoken of in the Epistle itself.—We may add that already the Gothic version has translated πιστοῖς, *faithful* ("*triggvaim*").

[2] Comp. Bengel.

[3] *Beitrage*, p. 133.

[4] So in substance also Reiche, *Comm. crit.* p. 122 : "*sanctis, iisdemque fidem in Christum profitentibus*," "to the saints, and the same professing faith in Christ."

In view of all that has been said, we must defend ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, i. 1, as *decidedly genuine.* But wherefore was it omitted at so early a period [1] in a portion of the codices? Certainly this omission was not a mere transcriber's error;[2] for not only is such an error in itself improbable at the very main point of the address, but it would not have obtained any considerable diffusion. Further, the possible reason, which may account at Rom. i. 7 for the absence of ἐν Ῥώμῃ in various MSS., namely, through a transcript of the Epistle for public reading in another particular church, is here at any rate improbable, since the manuscripts not containing ἐν Ἐφέσῳ must have been circulated in very different regions (Asia and Africa) and in very considerable number. This latter fact might point to the hypothesis that, by omitting ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, it was sought to give to an Epistle so general in tenor and weighty, the impress of a *Catholic* one.[3] But, in point of fact, the apostolic Epistles directed *ad quosdam*, "to some," were already of themselves regarded as written *ad omnes*, "to all,"[4] and hence there was no need of the procedure indicated. Equally inadmissible, moreover, is the view (see below), that from the very first in a portion of the manuscripts the place for the local name was left vacant, and thereby ἐν Ἐφέσῳ was omitted.[5] Nor yet can we accept *the dogmatic* reason, that the name of the place was expunged with a view to favor the metaphysical explanation of τοῖς οὖσιν, specified in Basil and Jerome, since the converse alone is natural, namely, that the metaphysical interpretation of τοῖς οὖσιν arose from the fact of the text being already deprived of the ἐν Ἐφέσῳ.

The omission would rather appear due to ancient *historical criticism.* From the contents of the letter at a very early period the inference had been drawn, that it was addressed to persons who were as yet personally unknown to the apostle, and still novices in Christianity.[6] And how naturally did this lead to the view that the Ephesians had *not* been the recipients, and so to the striking out of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ! The text written without ἐν Ἐφέσῳ was soon laid hold of to support the metaphysical explanation of τοῖς οὖσιν, which had arisen out of it; and the favor and diffusion which the latter received from its accordance with the taste of the age necessarily contributed to the spread of the text which was denuded of the ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. The omission of these words, thus originated and diffused, could not indeed do away with the correct ecclesiastical tradition of the Epistle being destined for Ephesus, or frustrate the preservation of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ and the triumph of that original reading (supported as it was by all the versions), which had been already achieved by the time of Jerome; but it did make it possible for Marcion, seeing that he already found ἐν Ἐφέσῳ no longer in the text, to alter, in opposition to tradition, the title πρὸς Ἐφεσίους into πρὸς Λαοδικέας, regarding the Epistle on the basis of Col. iv. 16 as addressed to the Laodiceans—in the service of the same criticism, under which, only handled in a negative sense, ἐν Ἐφέσῳ had disappeared.

---

[1] Marcion, Tertullian, the old MSS. in Basil.

[2] Lünemann.

[3] Comp. Wieseler, *Chronol. des apost. Zeitalt.* p. 438.

[4] Jerome, *c. Marc.* v. 17.

[5] Schott, *Isag.* p. 279, suggests that perhaps Paul himself had commissioned Tychicus to have copies for other churches made at Ephesus, and to have the names of these *other* churches inserted therein in place of the ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, which came from himself; and that a copyist had left a blank for the future insertion of the name, which he had forgotten thereafter to fill up.

[6] Historical traces of this ancient view are to be found in Theodoret, *Praef.*, and on i. 15, who relates "that some had asserted that Paul μηδέπω τοὺς Ἐφεσίους τεθεαμένον, 'never having seen the Ephesians,' had written this Epistle to them;" and also in Euthalius (*ap.* Zaccagni in *Collect. mon. vet. eccl.* p. 524): ἡ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους . . . ἧς ἐν τῇ προγραφῇ τὸ μυστήριον ἐκτίθεται, παραπλησίως τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους· ἀμφοτέροις δὲ ἐξ ἀκοῆς γνωρίμοις, καὶ εἰσὶν αὗται πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν ἀρχαὶ κατηχουμένων καὶ πιστῶν εἰσαγωγαί, "the Epistle to the Ephesians, in whose introduction the mystery is presented, just as in that to the Romans: to both known by hearing, and they are in distinction elements for catechumens and introductions for believers." Comp. also the *Synops. script. sacr.* in Athanasius, *Opp.* III. p. 194, ed. Bend.: ταύτην ἐπιστέλλει ἀπὸ Ῥώμης, οὔπω μὲν αὐτοὺς ἑωρακὼς, ἀκούσας δὲ μόνον περὶ αὐτῶν (τῶν Ἐφεσίων), "He writes this from Rome, not as yet having seen them, but only having heard of them" (*i.e.*, of the Ephesians).

But, it is said, the *contents*—quite general in tenor, without personal reminiscences and references, without salutations (not even Timotheus and Aristarchus are mentioned, as in Col. i. 1, iv. 10; Philem. 24), without any trace of that close intimacy in which Paul had stood to his Ephesian converts, as a father to his children [1]—are of such a character that the Epistle of itself betrays that it was not directed to the Ephesians; and the passages, i. 15, iii. 1–4, iv. 21, point to readers who had not been in any personal connection with the apostle. Mainly based on this internal character of the Epistle, we find two hypotheses concerning the readers for whom it was destined :—I. Following Marcion, Grotius, Hammond, Mill, Pierce, du Pin, Wall, the younger Vitringa, Venema, Wetstein, Paley, *et al.*, including, recently, Holzhausen and others (see on Col. iv. 16), as well as Räbiger,[2] have supposed [3] that the Epistle was addressed *to the Laodiceans*, as being personally unknown to the apostle (Col. ii. 1). While this hypothesis [4] falls of itself, if the genuineness of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is established, it may, moreover, be urged in opposition to it—(*a*) that from Marcion's procedure we may not infer an Asiatic tradition. For the ecclesiastical tradition is quite unanimous in regarding the Ephesians as readers of the Epistle; there is no trace of deviation; the heretic stands alone with his adherents, without any anticipation or echo of his critical paradox. (*b*) Since, according to Col. iv. 16, the Epistle to the Laodiceans had at the very first become known in two different churches,—in Laodicea and Colossae,—and without doubt was disseminated from both by copies, it is the more incomprehensible how the Ephesians could appropriate to themselves the Laodicean letter, and how universal ecclesiastical tradition could support this view without meeting with opposition in the church itself. The appeal to the earthquake, which, according to Tacitus, *Ann.* xiv. 27, in the year 60[1] destroyed Laodicea,[2] yields no result, since, according to Tacitus, *l.c.*, Laodicea was soon restored; and the Christian church there cannot have perished (Rev. iii.), still less the knowledge of the Epistle which Paul had written to them. No doubt, in view of Col. iv. 16, there must have been an affinity of contents between the Epistle to the Laodiceans and that to the Colossians, which seems to tell in favor of the identity of our Epistle with the former; but may not Paul, besides our Epistle and that to the Colossians, have written a third kindred in its contents? which has perished, like a letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor. v. 9), one to the Philippians (see on Phil. iii. 1, Remark), and perhaps also others, which have left no traces behind. (*c*) If our Epistle is the Epistle to the Laodiceans, it must have been written *before* the Epistle to the Colossians (Col. iv. 16), which, according to § 2, is not to be assumed. Indeed, at Eph. vi. 21 and Col. iv. 7, there might possibly be not even meant one and the same journey of Tychicus (which yet forces itself on us so undeniably in pursuance of the words and the geographical relations), seeing that Paul, in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv. 15), directs the Laodiceans, and an individual among them, *to be saluted*,—which, from the nature of the case, he would hardly have done, if he had been sending to them at the same time a *letter*, and that by so trusted a fellow-laborer,[3] who, besides, had to travel *by way of Laodicea* to Colossae (see on Col. iv. 16, Remark). (*d*) What Holzhausen says of Col. ii. 2, that it was written with a consciousness of the Epistle to the Ephesians, is purely imaginary.[4] Following Beza,[5] and Ussher,[6] Garnier,[7] Bengel, Benson, Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, Ziegler,[8] Justi,[9] Stolz, Haenlein,

---

[1] It is arbitrary and contrary to the manner of the apostle to assume, with Wurm (in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1833, I. p. 98), that Paul, because of painful experiences which he had had in Ephesus, avoided mention of previous occurrences. How altogether different is his procedure, especially in the Epistle to the Galatians!

[2] *Christologia Paul.* p. 48.

[3] See, in opposition to this assumption, also Satori, *über d. Laodicenerbrief*, Lübeck, 1853, and especially Reiche, p. 131 sqq. Reiche, however, considers our Epistle as identical with that mentioned in Col. iv. 16; in his view it was destined not *merely* for the Laodiceans, but also for *Hierapolis and other churches of that region*, and thence had no place specified in the opening address; but Paul had orally imparted to Tychicus more particular directions as to that point. See, in opposition to the alleged encyclical destination of the Epistle, generally what is said below under II. The view of Weiss is essentially similar to that of Reiche.

[4] To which Baur, p. 457, is also inclined.

---

[1] According to Eusebius, *Chron.*, and Orosius, *Hist.* vii. 7, only at a later date; see Wieseler, p 455.

[2] According to Eusebius and Orosius, Colossae and Hierapolis also.

[3] This enigma would only admit of solution from the domain of conjecture. The easiest thing would be to say, that Paul, when he had the Epistle to the Colossians with his salutation to the Laodiceans already completed, had only then resolved to send further with Tychicus *a letter* to the Laodiceans, in drawing up which he was aware that Tychicus would reach Laodicea before Colossae. But with all hypotheses, which are not made in the consistent following out of an ascertained fact, the ground falls away under our feet. Others have asserted that Paul wished to repeat the salutations, or that he had only, as he was writing to the Colossians, heard about Nymphas through Epaphras; but these, after all, are nothing but suppositions, which, moreover, are invalidated by the fact that our Epistle is to be placed *after* that to the Colossians (see § 2). Bertholdt considers the salutation in Col. iv. 15 merely as introduction to the subsequent commission ("have the letter brought to the Laodiceans with my salutation"). But how utterly in opposition to the connection!

[4] See, in opposition to it, Harless, p. xxxix.—II.

[5] Who, on the subscription to the Epistle, expresses the conjecture that it was sent not so much *ad Ephesios ipsos proprie*, "properly to the Ephesians themselves," as rather *to Ephesus*, "*ut ad ceteras Asiaticas ecclesias transmitteretur*," "that it might be transmitted to the other Asiatic churches;" and that hence, probably, arose the partial omission of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ.

[6] In his *Annales ad ann.* 64.

[7] *ad Basil. l.c.*

[8] In Henke's *Magaz.* IV. 2, p. 225 ff.

[9] *Vermischte Abhandlungen*, II. p. 81 ff.

Schmidt, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hug, Flatt, Hemsen, Schott, Feilmoser, Schrader, Schneckenburger, Neander, Rückert, Credner, Matthies, Meier, Harless, Böttger, Anger, Olshausen, Thiersch,[1] Guericke, Lange, Bleek, and others have, though with manifold variations in detail,[2] regarded our Epistle as a *circular letter.* In that case Ephesus has mostly been included in the circle of churches concerned, but sometimes—as by Koppe, Haenlein,[3] Eichhorn, Bertholdt, and Reiche—entirely excluded ; while Laodicea and its neighborhood have been in various ways brought in (according to Credner, *e.g.*, one copy of the letter was sent to *Ephesus* to be circulated among the churches on the west coast of Asia Minor ; and another copy to *Laodicea*, to be circulated among the churches in the interior), in fact, have even been regarded as the locality for which the Epistle was primarily and specially destined ; Bleek being withal of opinion that the Ephesians only got it to read from Tychicus on his journey to Phrygia, and retained for themselves a copy of it. But, in opposition to the view of any sort of *encyclical* destination, we may decisively again urge—(*a*) the universal and undivided ecclesiastical tradition, which does not exhibit the very slightest trace of such a destination. Indeed, both the orthodox and Marcion are here *at one*, since both name only one church as the receiver of the Epistle. And when we remember what a high honor any church could not but consider it to have received an apostolic writing, the utter disappearance of all knowledge that our Epistle had belonged to other churches, or had been claimed by them as their property, would be quite inconceivable. (*b*) Even apart from the circumstance that Paul does not in the Epistle give the slightest hint of any encyclical destination for it, the words of the *address* ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, which cannot critically be dislodged, expressly testify against it. Paul could not thus address it, if he had intended it for more extended circulation, or even for other localities.[4] How very differently he knew how to stamp on the face of the Epistles to the Corinthians the body of readers for whom they were intended ! But if the ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is held to be spurious

---

[1] *Kirche im apost. Zeitalt.* p. 145 sqq.

[2] See Lünemann, p. 33 sqq.

[3] Who has even lighted on the *Peloponnesus!*

[4] This holds also in oppostion to the form which Harless has given to the matter. The readers, in his view, were daughter-churches of Ephesus, or Christians scattered about the country, who had first been made acquainted with the gospel from Ephesus, and of whom Paul had received intelligence through the Ephesians. To these Christians he had forwarded the Epistle through the Ephesian church. But as the Ephesian church itself might also extract benefit and edification from it, the apostle had wished that the Epistle should be publicly read to the principal church and remain with it. Harless conceives of Tychicus as giving the following message to the Ephesians: "*I bring to you here a letter which concerns you all, but specially the Gentile Christians, of whom you have spoken to the apostle. Take care that the letter, when it has been read with you, should also come into their hands, ye who know best the ways and means for that end ; and bring me to them, in order that I, in accordance with the apostle's commission, may tell them what I have told you concerning his condition.*" Thus the letter would primarily and mainly have applied to readers *outside of* Ephesus, and Paul would have addressed it τοῖς οὖσιν ἘΝ Ἐφέσῳ? He would have suppressed its principal destination, and would have placed as the address only a mediate and subordinate one? No, Paul would have known how really to *express* in the opening address the relation which Harless has merely presupposed, if he had so conceived of it. See also Reiche, p. 127.

(against this view, see above), then the address, which *with* ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is too limited for a circular letter, would *without* these words be *too wide* for the purpose; for then *no* local definition of the readers *whatever* would be indicated, and the Epistle would present itself not as an *encyclical*, but as a *catholic*[1] Epistle. (*c*) If, with Rückert and Olshausen, we should assume that Paul, in the several copies which he gave to Tychicus, had left blank the name of the place in order that it might be subsequently filled up with the names of the churches concerned,[2] or that at least in some copies a vacant space was left to be filled up at pleasure,[3] this is (*α*) altogether an arbitrary transplanting of a modern procedure from the counting-houses of the present day back into the apostolic age, from which we have circular letters indeed, but no trace of such a process of drawing them out, the mechanical nature of which would hardly square with the spirit of the apostolic age. And (*β*) would not the Epistle, even if every church concerned had received a copy provided with its own name, have yet remained a circular letter? Thus, indeed, in the *individual* church-names of the different copies there would have been just so many contradictions to the proper destination of the Epistle. Why, then, should not Paul—in case of his giving to Tychicus the alleged circular letter in several copies—have named in every address uniformly the recipient churches as a whole? (*γ*) It would have been utter folly[4] if Paul in a portion of the copies had left the name of the place *blank*, to be filled up according to pleasure in a manner which had not already been fixed. Could he write i. 15 ff., vi. 22, without having quite a definite conception what churches he had in view? (*δ*) If only the *name* was to be left *blank*, why was ἐν also omitted? why did not the copies run τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν . . . καὶ πιστοῖς κ.τ.λ.? (*ε*) How inexplicable, that only copies with ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, and, in addition, those having no name whatever, should have had the good fortune to be preserved and distributed! Each of the churches in question would have sought to preserve and to multiply the copy addressed *to it* under *its* name; and *different* traditions with regard to the readers would inevitably have been current at a very early date in the church side by side. (*ζ*) If Laodicea was in the circle of churches in question, Colossae also was so (Col. iv. 16). But Colossae did not get the alleged circular letter through the despatch of a copy intended for the Colossians, and addressed to them, but had to procure for itself the Laodicean Epistle from Laodicea (Col. *l.c.*). These arguments tell at the same time against Bleek's hesitating conjecture, that Paul in the Epistle, which was primarily intended for Laodicea, Hierapolis, etc., had left a gap after τοῖς οὖσιν, because, at the time of writing the letter, he was not yet able to specify all the several churches ; as likewise against Anger's view, that the circular letter, primarily destined for Ephesus, had at the same time been destined for the daughter-churches of Asia, and among these, also for Laodicea ; that Tychicus had to bring it first to Ephesus, from whence it was to make its way to the other churches, and so to Laodicea, and from thence to Colossae. In opposition to this view, see Zeller[1] and Wieseler.[2] Similarly Laurent,[3] who assumes that Paul had intended the Epistle for the two churches, Laodicea and Ephesus, but had only despatched one copy for the two, in which he left the designation of the place open. Thus copies with designations of the place had arisen through transcripts, some with ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ, some with ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, the latter of which obtained the upper hand. But from the evidence of Tertullian (see above) we cannot gather that he had seen MSS. with ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ. Besides, there would subsist no reason at all why Paul, if he had written to these two churches, should not also have mentioned both of them in the address.

---

[1] Success cannot attend the attempt mentally to supply the local destination of the letter (that disappears with the rejection of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ) from any other quarter in dealing with so singular and nameless an address. Weiss, *l.c.* (comp. Reiche), thinks that Paul had given information to Tychicus for what circle of churches in Asia Minor the letter was intended; but that the later tradition had appropriated it to the chief town and chief church, and had completed the address accordingly. But that premiss is arbitrarily assumed, and this bold stroke of tradition would hardly have gained universal assent, especially in view of its enigmatic relation to the contents of the Epistle. If Ephesus did not from the first stand in the text, as Marcion did not read it, the latter would have acted *with more tact* in having recourse to *Laodicea*.

[2] Ussher first suggested this, followed by Garnier, Bengel, Eichhorn, Hug, and others.

[3] Moldenhauer, Michaelis, Bertholdt, Hemsen, and others.

[4] Comp. Matthaei, ed. min. III. p. 293.

In accordance with the foregoing discussion, no other critical procedure in ascertaining the readers of the Epistle rests on a historical basis but that adopted by most of the later commentators, which arrives at the conclusion that our Epistle was directed *to the Ephesians* and *to no further church*, in pursuance of the genuine ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, and in agreement with the primitive and universal tradition of the church. So among the later commentators Whitby, Wolf, Cramer, Morus, and more recently Rinck,[4] Wurm,[5] Wiggers,[6] Wieseler.[7] We must, however, candidly confess that, while the difficulties of the individual passages i. 15, iii. 1–4, iv. 21, may be elucidated by their exegesis, the tone and contents of so general a tenor, the absence of any reminiscences of personal connection with the readers, the want of salutations, etc., in an Epistle to the Ephesians, remain more surprising than would be the case in any other Epistle. The appeal made by Wieseler[8] to the elevated and didactic character of the Epistle is not sufficient to explain this strange phenomenon ; we lack the historical information for this purpose, and scientific modesty and prudence prefer to confess in this case the *non liquet*, rather than to construct hypotheses which, as has been shown, fall to pieces of themselves.[1] There must have existed historical circumstances which occasioned the Epistle to receive the strange form that it undoubtedly has, but we are not acquainted with them. It is very natural, however, to think of the phenomenon in question as, in part at least, causally connected with the mission of Tychicus. In accordance with vi. 21 f., Paul may have reserved all details to be orally communicated by the latter, who seemed specially fitted for this purpose, since he, as an inhabitant of Asia,[2] as a witness of Paul's farewell to the presbyters (Acts xx. 4), and also named elsewhere as an emissary to Ephesus (2 Tim. iv. 12), was undoubtedly very accurately acquainted with the relations of Paul to the Ephesians; while on the part also of the apostle himself there might be special motives (based possibly on the accusation brought against him by the Jews, Acts xxi. 28, 29, and on the covetousness of the venal Felix, Acts xxiv. 26), arising from the conditions of his imprisonment and surveillance, for his deeming it advisable by way of precaution to compose his Epistle to *this* particular church, with which he was on the *most intimate* footing, *without* setting forth personal relations and special circumstances. Nevertheless, this Epistle, as an apostolical letter to the Ephesians, with its so general, and, even in various particulars, surprising contents, remains an enigma awaiting further solution; and we must confess that if Ephesus had not been *given* as the place of destination, criticism would least of all have been likely to light upon *this* church among the Asiatic churches known to us. [See Note I., p. 308.]

---

[1] *Theol. Jahrb.* 1844, I. p. 199 ff.

[2] *Chronol. d. ap. Zeitalt.* p. 442 sq.

[3] In the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1866, p. 131.

[4] *Sendschr. der Korinther*, p. 31 ff., and in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, p. 948 ff.

[5] In the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1833, I. p. 97 f.

[6] Yet he also takes up the view (already expressed by Beza in his remarks on the subscription), that the apostle has not merely regarded the word spoken to the Ephesians as spoken to them, but has desired and designed a diffusion of the Epistle among, and a knowledge of it in, wider circles, so that under the one church he is addressing the whole body of Asiatic Christians, which had Ephesus as their mother-church and centre. But against this view it must be urged—apart from the circumstance that St. Paul *says* nothing whatever of this supposed design—that in all the other Epistles too he might presuppose their being communicated to wider circles, and yet is not thereby withheld from entering into particulars, sending salutations, and the like. In the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1841, p. 412 ff.

[7] *Chronol. d. apost. Zeitalt.* p. 443.

[8] p. 449.

SEC. 2.—PLACE AND TIME OF COMPOSITION.

St. Paul was a *prisoner* when he wrote the Epistle, iii. 1, iv. 1, vi. 20. It has always been the prevailing opinion that this imprisonment was the captivity *at Rome*, narrated in the Acts of the Apostles. But David Schulz,[3] and after him Schneckenburger,[4] Schott,[5] Böttger,[6] Wiggers,[7] Thiersch,[8] Reuss,[9] Schenkel,[10] and Zöckler,[11] have decided in favor of the captivity at

---

[1] This holds also of those hypotheses, which do not keep to the view of the Christian church at Ephesus as such, regarded as a whole, being the readers of the Epistle. Thus Neudecker (*Einl.* p. 502) holds that the Epistle is directed to that *portion* of the church which had been converted by the disciples of the apostle after he had left Ephesus; and Lünemann conceives that Paul has written to a church which had been founded but a short time before in the immediate *neighborhood of Ephesus*, and which was so closely bound up with the Ephesian Church that it might be considered as a *part* of it. Such hypotheses are strikingly and decisively disposed of by the simple and definite τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, which does not admit of any more limited interpretation than the addresses τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμη, Rom. i. 7; τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλίπποις, Phil. i. 1, etc.

[2] Perhaps even from Ephesus. In Acts xx. 4, Tychicus and Trophimus are named as "of Asia," but the latter at least is definitely designated in xxi. 29 as an *Ephesian*.

[3] In the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1829, p. 612 ff.

[4] *Beitr.* p. 144 f.

[5] Graul (Lips. 1836) wrote in opposition to Schulz and Schott.

[6] In connection, doubtless, with his hypothesis that that Roman imprisonment only lasted a few days.

[7] In the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1841, p. 436 ff.

[8] *d. Kirche im apost. Zeitalt.* p. 176.

[9] *Gesch. der heil. Schr. N. T.* § 114.

[10] Comp. also Weiss in Herzog's *Encykl.* XIX. p. 718.

[11] In Vilmar's *Pastoral-theol. Blätt.* 1863, p. 277 f.

Caesarea. And rightly so. Not, however, as if the friends of Paul, who are named in the contemporary letters to the Colossians and to Philemon (Col. iv. 9–14 ; Philem. 10 ff., 23 f.), could not have been with him at Rome, as has been sought to be inferred from the Epistle to the Philippians, which only (i. 1) mentions Timotheus ;[1] nor, again, on account of πρὸς ὥραν, Philem. 15, which expression as contrasted with αἰώνιον by no means presupposes merely a quite short separation of the runaway Onesimus from his master ; nor yet because Paul at Rome could not have obtained sufficiently accurate information concerning Colossae, for this might, in fact, have been got sufficiently by means of Epaphras (Col. iv. 12) ;—but, (1) because it is in itself more natural and probable that the slave Onesimus had run away from Colossae as far as Caesarea, than that he should have fled, at the cost of a long journey by sea, to Rome, the more especially as the fugitive was not yet a Christian. The objection,[2] that in the great city of Rome he would have been more secure from being tracked by the *fugitivarii*, who were everywhere on the look-out for runaway slaves, cannot be maintained, since this police-agency was certainly most to be dreaded in the capital itself and *in the company of a state-prisoner.* (2) If our Epistle and the Epistle to the Colossians had been sent *from* Rome, then would its bearer Tychicus, who was accompanied by Onesimus (Col. iv. 8, 9), have arrived at Ephesus first, and then at Colossae ; and accordingly we might reasonably expect that Paul would have mentioned to the Ephesians along with Tychicus (Eph. vi. 21, 22) his companion Onesimus (as he does in Col. iv. 8, 9), in order by that means to prepare for his beloved Onesimus a good reception among the Ephesians. If, on the contrary, Tychicus started with Onesimus *from* Caesarea, he arrived by the most direct road, in keeping with the design of the journey of Onesimus, first at Colossae, where he left the slave with his master, and thence passed on to Ephesus ; accordingly Paul had, in the circumstance that Onesimus did not go with Tychicus to Ephesus, a natural reason for not including a mention of Onesimus in the Epistle to the Ephesians.[3] It is not enough to explain this non-mention from the general absence of individual references in our Epistle (Wieseler), since here the question concerns a single passage, which *is really* of an individual and personal tenor. (3) In Eph. vi. 21, ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς, this καί indicates the conception that, when Tychicus should come to the Ephesians, he would have already fulfilled the aim here expressed in the case of others. And these others are the Colossians (Col. iv. 8, 9), with regard to whom, therefore, Paul knew that Tychicus would come *first* to them, which again tells in favor not of Rome, but of Caesarea, as the starting-point. If the messenger had been despatched from Rome, and so had proceeded from Ephesus to Colossae, we should then have expected the καί at the corresponding passage in the *Epistle to the Colossians.*[4] Further, (4) Paul, in Philem. 22, asks Philemon to prepare a lodging for him, and that, too, for *speedy* use.[1] This, on the one hand, presupposes the fact that his present place of imprisonment was much nearer to Colossae than the far distant Rome, especially considering the slowness of navigation in those days; on the other hand,—and this is withal the main point,—we must assume, in the light of this request, that Paul thought of coming from his place of imprisonment, after the speedy release which he hoped for, *direct* to Phrygia, and in particular to Colossae unto Philemon, without making any intermediate journeys, since otherwise there would be no motive for the request as to the *immediate* preparation of a lodging for him at the house of Philemon *simultaneously* with the taking back of Onesimus. But now it is plain from Phil. ii. 24 that Paul, when he was lying a prisoner at *Rome* and was there hoping for his liberation, intended to journey to *Macedonia* (not to Spain, to which his views had been directed earlier, Rom. xv. 24),—which, after what has been said above, is not in keeping with the bespeaking of a lodging with *Philemon.* This bespeaking, on the other hand, is quite appropriate, if Paul was at Caesarea. From that place, after the speedy release which he hoped for, he intended to journey through Phrygia and Asia generally, and next to carry out his old plan, which was directed to Rome (Rom. i. 10 ff.; Acts xix. 21). Whether at this time he still entertained his earlier plan of a journey *to Spain* (Rom. xv. 24; at Phil. ii. 24 he had given it up), is a matter of indifference for our question. But it is certain that Paul at Caesarea, considering his gentle treatment and the lax prosecution of his trial under Felix, might hope for speedy liberation (Acts xxiv. 23, 26). It has been maintained[2] that neither the freedom to preach (vi. 19; Col. iv. 3 f. is not here relevant), nor the conversion of Onesimus (Philem. 10), suit his condition at Caesarea, but that they suit only his position at Rome according to Acts xxviii. 30 f.; but this is to assert too much, for the notice at Acts xxiv. 23 leaves sufficient scope for our recognizing such activity on the part of the captive Paul even in Caesarea. Comp. Introd. to Col. § 2.

---

[1] In any case the Epistle to the Philippians was written later. But these friends might just as well have been with the apostle at Rome as at Caesarea, as certainly was the case with Aristarchus (Col. iv. 10 ; Philem. 24), Acts xxvii. 2.

[2] See Wieseler, p. 417.

[3] Comp. Wiggers, *l.c.* p. 440 ff.

[4] Wiggers appeals to ver. 22, holding, namely, that Paul could not legitimately

If, accordingly, Paul composed the Epistle in *Caesarea*, the date of its composition is either A.D. 60 or A.D. 61.

Finally, the question *whether this Epistle or that to the Colossians was first written*, is not to be answered on a psychological basis[3] by considering their inner relationship and peculiar character, because in that case there is too much scope left for subjectivity,—as, indeed, on such grounds some have

---

have written ὃν ἔπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο κ.τ.λ., if Tychicus must, in the very nature of the case from his being destined for Colossae, have come to Ephesus. But wrongly. For even if Tychicus, in virtue of the direction of his journey (from Rome to Colossae), would necessarily have been brought by the way of Ephesus, he might nevertheless have merely passed through it, if St. Paul had not expressly given him orders for the definite object of Eph. vi. 22, and entrusted him with commissions to the church. The fact that Tychicus must necessarily have travelled by way of Ephesus would not therefore exclude the truth of the ἔπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ. We may add, that from Rome the travellers might have reached Colossae, without even touching at Ephesus,—by way of Miletus possibly,—so that Paul, if Rome be presupposed as the starting-point, might the more fitly write these words.

[1] See on Philem. *l.c.*

[2] See Wieseler, p. 420, Guericke, and others.

[3] As, *e.g.*, by Credner, § 157, who holds that

found the Epistle to the Ephesians the earlier;[1] nor yet by inferring, with Hug, from the *non-mention of Timothy* in the Epistle to the Ephesians, that this Epistle was written earlier than the letters to the Colossians and to Philemon, because in the latter Timothy shares in the salutation, and must thus have have joined Paul later.[2] But that the Epistle to the Colossians was written before that to the Ephesians, is to be assumed for the following reasons : (1) As Colossae was the first and nearest goal which Tychicus, in company with the Colossian Onesimus, would reach from Caesarea (see above), it could not but be the most natural and obvious course for the apostle to write the letter to the Colossians sooner than *the* letter which was to be delivered only *at a further* stage of his friend's journey ; (2) *καὶ ὑμεῖς*, vi. 21, refers to the passage Col. iv. 7, and presupposes that Paul had already written and had in his recollection this latter Epistle. If, indeed, the Epistle to the Laodiceans were identical with the Epistle to the Ephesians, then, according to Col. iv. 16, the Epistle to the Colossians would necessarily be the later. But see § 1, and on Col. iv. 16.

SEC. 3.—GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

After previous expressions of doubt on the part of Schleiermacher[3] and Usteri, de Wette has come forward more decidedly than before, assailing the genuineness of the Epistle ;[4] and the critics of Baur's school[5] relegate the Epistle to the age of Gnosticism and Montanism, whereas de Wette[6] still allows it to belong to the apostolic age, and to a gifted disciple of the apostle as its author. So too Ewald;[7] he denies that it was written by Paul, but yet places it much nearer to the great apostle than the Pastoral Epistles ; while Weisse[8] lightly characterizes it as an unapostolic paraphrase

---

the Epistle to the Ephesians was written earlier—(1) Because its aim is the more general, and that of the Epistle to the Colossians, as the special, is subordinate. (2) Because the former, as directed (according to Credner's view) to unknown Pauline Christians in Asia, would have required the most mature consideration, whereas the Epistle to the Colossians would be much more easily drawn up, since Paul had Epaphras and Onesimus with him—and so it could not fail but that a portion of the ideas laid down in the former Epistle would be transferred also to the latter, in such wise that what was there general in tenor would assume a special form. (3) Because in our Epistle the expression is more abstract, etc. —It would not be difficult, with equal plausibility, to invert the relation, and to represent the more special, the easier, and more concrete as psychologically *antecedent* to the more general, more difficult, and more abstract shape.

[1] Cornelius à Lapide, Böhmer, Credner, Schneckenburger, Matthies, Anger, Guericke, Reuss, and others that to the Colossians (Schleiermacher, Harless, Neander, Meier, Wiggers, de Wette, Bleek, Weiss).

[2] We might, in fact, with equal right infer the converse, viz., that Timothy had, at the writing of the Epistle to the Ephesians, already left Paul again and had journeyed to some other quarter, so that this Epistle would be the later—as Schott really judges it to be.

[3] *Vorl. üb. Einl. I. N. T.* p. 165 f., 194.

[4] *Exeget. Handbuch, zweite Aufl.* 1847, and *Einl., fünfte Aufl.* 1848.

[5] Schwegler, *krit. Miscellen zum Epheserbr.*, in Zeller's *theol. Jahrb.* 1844, 2, p. 378 ff.; *nachapostol. Zeitalt.* II. p. 330 ff., 375 ff.; Baur, *Paulus*, p. 418 ff., comp. also his *Christenth. d. drei ersten Jahrh.* p. 104 ff.

[6] Comp. Schleiermacher.

[7] *Sendschr. d. P.* p. xii.; *Geschichte d. apost. Zeit.* p. 243 ff.

[8] *Dogmat.* I. p. 146.

of the Epistle to the Colossians, and Hausrath[1] speaks of it as an Epistle to the Laodiceans retouched by another hand.

De Wette's reasons, in addition to his finding the destination for Ephesus unsuitable, are as follow : that the Epistle, which is devoid of all specially distinctive character in its aim and references, is so dependent on the Epistle to the Colossians, which is almost a mere verbose amplification of it, as to be out of keeping, when divested of the reference to the false teachers. Such a copying from himself is unworthy of the apostle ; the style, too, is un-Pauline, overladen as it is with parentheses and accessory clauses, involving a want of connection (ii. 1, 5, iii. 1, 13), copious in words but poor in thoughts ; so, too, are the divergences in particular expressions,[2] as well as in the thoughts, doctrinal opinions, and mode of teaching.[3] But (*a*) while the absence of any concrete and direct peculiarity of character in its aim and references is surprising, it is altogether unfavorable to any doubts as to its genuineness, partly because the bringing out at all of a writing under an apostle's name and authority makes us presuppose more definite tendencies and more readily recognizable conditions as aimed at in it ; partly because, in particular, the circumstances of the Ephesian church, and the close relationship of the apostle to them, must have been so generally known, that a non-apostolic author would either have deliberately taken account of and employed them, or else, if the design of his undertaking permitted it, would have made another and happier selection of an address than this very ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. He who could prepare under the name of the apostle an Epistle of so throughly Pauline a tenor, must have been quite able to imitate him in the mention and handling of concrete circumstances, and would, by such an omission of those matters as is apparent in our Epistle, neither have satisfied himself nor have answered his design of personating Paul—so much would he have failed in acting his part. The very fact that the Epistle, *as an Epistle to the Ephesians*, had its genuineness so generally recognized by the ancient church, is, when we consider the general nature of its contents, which always remains mysterious, a doubly valid evidence that this recognition has historically arisen out of immediate and objective certainty. Further, (*b*) as regards the relation of the Epistle to that to the Colossians, there appear, as is well known, many resemblances in matter and form—some even literal—between the two Epistles.[1] This may, however, be sufficiently explained, in part subjectively from the fact that Paul had just written the Epistle to the Colossians before writtng to the Ephesians, so that his mind was still full of and pervaded by the ideas, warnings, and exhortations which he had expressed in the former ; in part objectively, from the fact that the state of affairs at Ephesus must have been well enough known to the apostle to induce him to repeat various portions of the writing which he had just composed for another Asiatic church, and that to such a degree that he considered it fitting even to reproduce various things word for word from the Epistle to the Colossians, which lay before him. To declare this a course unworthy of the apostle is rash, since we have no other pair of letters from his hand issued so contemporaneously and under the influence of so similar a train of thought. But while certainly several elements from the Epistle to the Colossians have been *amplified as to verbal expression* in ours, there are also several that are reproduced in a *more concise* form (*e.g.*, i. 15–17 compared with Col. i. 3, 4 ; Eph. ii. 16 with Col. i. 20 ; Eph. iv. 32 with Col. iii. 12 f., and others) ; and those amplifications admit of natural explanation from renewed dwelling on the same thoughts, in which Paul did not proceed mechanically, and a mind such as his easily had recourse to more words rather than fewer in setting forth the subject afresh. At any rate, de Wette's judgment of it as *almost nothing but a verbose amplification*, is exaggerated, seeing that the two Epistles present in their course of thought, tenor, and mode of treatment very essential differences,[2] and the conclusion that a pseudo-Paul was at work would, at all events, be too hasty, so long as it was not from other sufficient grounds clear that Paul could not have been himself the amplifier. On the other hand, it is scarcely conceivable of an amplifying imitator, that one so intimately acquainted with the apostle's ideas and diction, should have chosen *a single* Pauline Epistle for the sole and often literal basis of his

---

[1] *d. Ap. Paulus*, 1865, p. 2, 138.

[2] "ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, i. 3, 20, ii. 6, iii. 10, vi. 12; τὰ πνευματικά, vi. 12 ; διάβολος, iv. 27, vi. 11 (elsewhere only in 1 and 2 Tim.) ; κοσμοκράτωρ, vi. 12 ; σωτήριον, vi. 16. Words differently used : οἰκονομία, i. 10, iii. 2, 9 ; μυστήριον, v. 32 (as in Rev. i. 20, xvii. 5, 7) ; πλήρωμα, i. 23 (comp. Col. i. 19, ii. 9) ; εὐλογία, i. 3 ; αἰών, ii. 2 ; περιποίησις, i. 14 ; ἀφθαρσία, vi. 24 ; μανθάνειν, iv. 20 ; φωτίζειν, iii. 9 ; πληροῦσθαι ἐν, v. 18 ; πλη. εἰς, iii. 19 ; the combinations βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ, v. 5 ; τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου, v. 17. Interruption and resumption of the construction, iii. 2–14 ; the constructions ἴστε γινώσκοντες, v. 5 ; ἵνα φοβῆται, v. 33 ; ἵνα with the optative, i. 17, iii. 26. Frequent omission of the article before defining additions, i. 3, 15, ii. 7, 11, 15, 21 f., and other passages ; diffuseness and pleonasm, i. 19, vi. 10, iii. 18 ; ii. 6 f., 21 (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), and various other points."

[3] "Unbecoming appeal of the apostle to his insight, iii. 4 ; putting together of the apostles and prophets, ii. 20, iii. 5 ; arbitrary use of the passage in the Psalms at iv. 8 ; quotation of a non-biblical passage, v. 14 ; the conceptions of demonology, ii. 2, vi. 12 ; the characteristics of God, i. 17, iii. 9, 15 ; the laying stress on Old Testament promise, v. 2 f. ; the dissuasion from theft, iv. 28 ; the un-Pauline salutation. vi. 23 f."

---

[1]

Eph.	i. 7,	comp. Col.	i. 14.
"	i. 10,	" "	i. 20.
"	i. 15–17,	" "	i. 3, 4.
"	i. 18,	" "	i. 27.
"	i. 21,	" "	i. 16.
"	i. 22 f.,	" "	i. 18 f.
"	ii. 1, 12,	" "	i. 21.
"	ii. 5,	" "	ii. 13.
"	ii. 15,	" "	ii. 14.
"	ii. 16,	" "	i. 20.
"	iii. 1,	" "	i. 24.
"	iii. 2,	" "	i. 25.
"	iii. 3,	" "	i. 26.
"	iii. 7,	" "	i. 23, 25.
"	iii. 8 f.,	" "	i. 27.
"	iv. 1,	" "	i. 10.
"	iv. 2,	" "	iii. 12 f.
"	iv. 3 f.,	" "	iii. 14 f.
"	iv. 15 f.,	" "	ii. 19.
"	iv. 19,	" "	iii. 1, 5.
"	iv. 22 ff.,	" "	iii. 8 ff.
"	iv. 25 f.	" "	iii. 8 f.
Eph.	iv. 29,	comp. Col.	iii. 8, iv. 6.
"	iv. 31,	" "	iii. 8.
"	iv. 32,	" "	iii. 12 f.
"	v. 3,	" "	iii. 5.
"	v. 4,	" "	iii. 8.
"	v. 5,	" "	iii. 5.
"	v. 6,	" "	iii. 6.
"	v. 15,	" "	iv. 5.
"	v. 19 f.,	" "	iii. 16 f.
"	v. 21,	" "	iii. 18.
"	v. 25,	" "	iii. 19.
"	vi. 1,	" "	iii. 20.
"	vi. 4,	" "	iii. 21.
"	vi. 5 ff.,	" "	iii. 22 ff.
"	vi. 9,	" "	iv. 1.
"	vi. 18 ff.,	" "	iv. 2 ff.
"	vi. 21 f.,	" "	iv. 7 f.

See the table in de Wette, p. 286 ff. Comp. Bemmelen, *Diss. de epp. ad Eph. et Col. inter se collat.*, Lugd. Bat. 1803.

[2] See Harless, p. lxix. ff.; Lünemann, *de Ep. ad Eph. authentiâ*, etc., p. 10 ff.

work; for thereby he would merely have imposed an unnecessary restriction on himself, and have increased the probability of his fiction, made up though it might be in the best sense, being recognized as such. A man, who could think and write in so Pauline a manner as that wherein the portions not parallel to the Colossian Epistle are thought and written, might with ease have given to his pretended apostolic treatise a shape quite different and not so palpably exhibiting any *single* source. (*c*) With respect to the objections taken to the style of the Epistle as too diffuse, loaded with parentheses and accessory clauses, carrying with it a want of connection (ii. 1, 5, iii. 1, 13), verbose, and poor in new ideas, it is to be observed, first, and generally, that this verdict is an unfavorable judgment resting on taste and subjective in character; and, secondly, that in its individual concrete references it relates to a certain peculiarity of the Epistle, which yet is not un-Pauline, seeing that, in fact, the unity of mould and flow, the *pectus atque indoles Paulinae mentis*, "the heart and character of the Pauline mind,"[1] which pervades it from beginning to end,[2] leads us more fairly and justly to set down the greater diffuseness, and what is called overloading, *to the account of* the apostle *himself*, deeply moved as he was by his subject. There is greater diffuseness certainly, but how natural is this, when we consider the general character of the grand subject-matter and of its evolution, and the absence of casual contents! There are a number of parentheses and accessory clauses certainly, but not after an un-Pauline fashion, and natural enough to a writer so full of the ideas concerned and the collateral thoughts suggested by them. Nowhere is there in reality want of connection, as it is the province of the exposition to show. A poverty of new ideas is merely apparent in proportion to the standard of the expectation cherished *a priori;* the letter abounds in many-sided modifications and expanded statements of thoughts which were vividly present to the writer's mind, in part from the Epistle to the Colossians, but a rich accession of new ideas was neither withal intended nor called forth by dialectic controversy (as to the copiousness of diction, see above). As respects (*d*) the particular divergences of style, *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* are found in every Epistle of Paul, as well as other peculiar modes of expression, as may readily be conceived in the case of a letter-writer having so delicate and comprehensive a mastery of the Greek language; but no one of the proofs brought forward by de Wette (which are in part inappropriately selected, and, on the other hand, might have had their number increased), is *at variance with* the idiosyncrasy of the apostle. And, further, (*e*) *ἅπαξ νοούμενα* are not appropriate grounds for doubting the genuineness of a writing in dealing with one whose mind was so inexhaustibly *rich*, and whose conception moved with such admirable *freedom* and *many-sidedness* in the Christian sphere, as was the case with St. Paul. Everything which is adduced as surprising in conception and doctrine may be psychologically and historically explained as standing in full accord with the pure Pauline Gospel (see the exposition), and the objections which are taken to the *mode* of teaching find analogies in other Pauline Epistles, and rest upon aesthetic presuppositions, which in a historico-critical examination of the New Testament writings supply us with but very uncertain criteria, seeing that in such a case modern taste is much too easily called in as an extraneous ground influencing the judgment. The more candidly de Wette speaks out as to the Epistle not having been composed in the apostolic age, and makes a *gifted disciple* of Paul to be its author, the more insoluble he makes the riddle, that such an one should have left his treatise without trace of individual historical relations of the apostle to the Ephesians, which it would have been so easy for him to interweave. Lastly, the reasons urged by the school of Baur, according to which this Epistle and the companion Epistle to the Colossians, forming a spurious pair, are held to be a product of Gnosis in opposition to Ebionitism,[1] are disposed of, when the exposition, dealing in a strictly objective manner, demonstrates in the very places which have been called in question simply *Pauline* contents. See, in opposition to Baur's contrast, specially Klöpper,[2] and with regard to the Christology of our letter and that to the Colossians, Räbiger.[3] The more decisive in that case becomes the weight, which the *external attestation* by uninterrupted church-tradition throws into the scale. This attestation has been even dated back to the *Apostolic Fathers;* but in Ignatius, *Eph.* 12, the Epistle is not at all directly mentioned,[4] and in Polycarp, *Phil.* 12, where it is said : "ut *in his scripturis* dictum est : *Irascimini et nolite peccare*, et : *Sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram*," "that in these writings, it is said : 'Be ye angry and sin not,' and 'Let not the sun go down upon your wrath,'" there is no quotation of Eph. iv. 26, but rather, as *in his scripturis*, "in these writings" (comp. immediately before : *in sacris literis*, "in the Holy Scriptures") and the intervening *et*, "and," prove, the citation of two *Old Testament sayings*, namely, Ps. iv. 5 and Deut. xxiv. 13, 15, though the *connecting* of these two passages may be based on a reminiscence of our Epistle.[5] Apart from the citations in the interpolated Ignatian letters, the undoubted and express ecclesiastical attestation begins with Irenaeus, *Haer.* v. 2, 3, and v. 14. 3, and is not interrupted by any contradiction.[6] Even the Valentinians already in Irenaeus,

---

[1] Erasmus.

[2] "Idem in hac epistola Pauli fervor, eadem profunditas, idem omnino spiritus ac pectus," "In this epistle of Paul there is the same fervor, the same depth, and altogether the same spirit and heart."

---

[1] Comp. on Col. Introd. § 3.

[2] *De orig. epp. ad Eph. et Col.*, Gryph. 1853.

[3] *De Christologia Paulina*, p. 42 ff.; Lange, *apost. Zeitalt.* I. 1, p. 119 ff. Lange, however, wrongly defines the Christological distinction of the two Epistles, p. 117, to the effect, that in the Ephesian letter Christ is the Omega, in the Colossian the Alpha, of all things. In both letters He is the A and the Ω, but in the Colossian letter the Christological theme stands in the foreground, and is treated more sedulously and more comprehensively.

[4] See above, § 1.

[5] The general question, whether at this date Apostolic Fathers adduce *New Testament* sayings with ὡς γέγραπται, γραφή, and the like, does not therefore pertain to us here. Specially important in this relation is the citation in Barnabas 4, in regard to which Credner, *Beitr.* I. p. 28, has been mistaken in answering that question in the negative, as the Codex Sinaiticus showed. The citation from Barnabas is certainly not to be referred to a *written source generally* (Weizsäcker), nor even to 4 Esdr. viii. 3, which passage is held to be confounded with Matth. xix. 30 (Volkmar).

[6] Marcion held it as Pauline, but as addressed to the Laodiceans.

i. 8. 5, cite Eph. v. 13 expressly as a saying of Paul, and in the *Philosoph.* of Origen, vi. 34, as γραφή.

Remark. — The apparent resemblances to the first Epistle of Peter of expressions and thoughts in the Epistle to the Ephesians[1] are too little characteristic adequately to justify us in presupposing a dependence of our Epistle on that of Peter.[2] We should rather assume the converse, when we remember how strictly Paul preserved and acutely vindicated his apostolic independence; but it is quite sufficient to take our stand on the creative power of the church-language formed by Paul, from which Peter was neither able nor willing to hold himself aloof, while it remains an open question whether he had read *Epistles* of Paul. 2 Pet. (iii. 15 f.) is not genuine.

SEC. 4.—OCCASION, OBJECT, AND CONTENTS.

We are unable to perceive from the letter itself any special occasion given for it *on the part of the Ephesians ;* hence it seems to have been called forth by mere accident through the mission of Tychicus and Onesimus to Colossae—an opportunity, which Paul made use of to send Tychicus also to Ephesus, in order not only to supply the Christians there with (oral) news of him, and to obtain news of them, but also to address to them a written discourse, partly on the glory of redemption and of their state as Christians, partly on the conduct in keeping with it, in order to strengthen and further them in steadfastness and unity of faith and Christian morality ; yet not so, that the proper aim of the Epistle[3] is to be discerned in the irenic section iv. 1–16. There are no traces of Ephesian false teachers, similar to those at Colossae,[4] in the Epistle (for iv. 14 f. may be explained from the general experience of the apostle, and v. 6 relates to *moral* seductions) ; neither is a *precautionary* regard to such theosophy and asceticism[5] at any rate capable of proof, since in the Epistle itself it is not at all hinted at. Bengel well says : "Singulare haec epistola specimen praebet tractationis evangelicae *in thesi* . . . inde nullum speciatim errorem aut vitium refutat aut redarguit, sed *generatim incedit*," "This epistle furnishes a unique specimen of evangelical treatment thetically . . . hence he refutes or reproves no error or vice specially, but *proceeds generally*." Paul may, however, have had in the background the thought of the possible approach of that Gnostic danger, though he did not consider it necessary or suitable at this time to furnish an express reference or warning to that effect.

As regards *contents*, the Epistle divides itself into a predominantly dogmatic and a predominantly hortatory portion. The *dogmatic* portion is a lofty[6] effusion over the glory and blessedness of the redemption effected through Christ, to which also the readers, formerly Gentiles, had attained, and thereafter over the relation of the apostle to this saving dispensation, and to the share of the readers therein (chap. i. iii.). The *hortatory* portion summons them to a conduct worthy of their calling, and, first of all, to Christian unity (iv. 1–16) ; and then to a moral walk opposed to their previous Gentile life—which is illustrated in detail as concerns very diversified conditions and relations (iv. 17–vi. 20). By way of *conclusion*, Paul refers, as regards his personal relations, to Tychicus, of whose mission he specifies the object (vi. 21 f.), and ends with a double benediction (vi. 23 f.).—Luther (in his editions of the N. T. down to 1537) reckons the Epistle among "the genuine and noblest books of the New Testament, which show to thee Christ, and teach everything which it is necessary and good for thee to know, even though thou shouldest never see or hear any other book or doctrine."

---

[1] See Weiss, *Petrin. Lehrbegr.* p. 426 ff., who has, however, adduced under this head far too much.

[2] Weiss, who considers both genuine; Schwegler, who regards both as spurious.

[3] de Wette.

[4] This in opposition to Michaelis, Haenlein, Flatt, Schott, Neudecker, and others.

[5] See Schneckenburger, *Beitr.* p. 135 ff.; Olshausen ; comp. also Meier and Weiss.

[6] ὑψηλῶν σφόδρα γέμει τῶν νοημάτων καὶ ὑπερόγκων· ἃ γὰρ μηδαμοῦ σχεδὸν ἐφθέγξατο, ταῦτα ἐνταῦθα δηλοῖ, "He is exceedingly full of thoughts and lofty things ; what he almost nowhere utters, that he here explains," Chrysostom.

NOTE BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

I. *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ.* (See p. 299.)

Meyer is supported also by Alford (who answers at length, vol. iii. pp. 13–18, the contrary arguments of Conybeare and Howson), Eadie, Ellicott, Wordsworth, Braune, Riddle, Scrivener (Introd. to Criticism of N. T., Second Ed., p. 101). On the other hand, see Schaff (Church History, I., p. 779), and Westcott and Hort, in Appendix to N. T., pp. 123 sqq. The latter would retain the reading in different type, as " a legitimate but unavoidably partial supplement to the true text, filling up a chasm which might be perplexing to a reader in later times."

Παύλου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Εφεσίους.

A B D E F G K ℵ, min. have the shorter and older superscription: *πρὸς Ἐφεσίους*. I, min.: *τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Παύλου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἐφες.*

CHAPTER I.

Ver. 1. *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*] See Introd. § 1. Tisch. has put it in brackets. — Ver. 3. *ἐν* before *Χριστῷ* is wanting only in some min.,—an omission, which, although followed in the editions of Erasmus, Steph. 3, and Beza, and approved of by Mill, is not at all deserving of notice as a various reading. — Ver. 6. *ἐν ᾗ*] A B ℵ* min. Chrys. (alic.) have *ἧς*. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. [Tisch. Treg.] and Rück., and rightly so. The attraction was resolved partly by the simple *ᾗ* (so Theophyl. Ambrosiast.), partly, in keeping with the prevalence of *ἐν* in the context, by *ἐν ᾗ*, which latter is defended by Reiche on insufficient grounds. — Ver. 10. *τα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*] The *τέ* read in Elz. after *τά* is, on decisive evidence, deleted by the later editors (except Harless). But in place of *ἐν*, B D E L ℵ* min. Theodoret, Dam. Oecum. Tert. have *ἐπί*, which Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. Hofm.] and Rück. have rightly received. The *usual* form of conception, *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* (comp. iii. 15), superseded the apparently unsuitable *ἐπί*. At Col. i. 20, many min. Chrys. and Theodoret have likewise *ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, where *ἐπί*, indeed, is too weakly attested, but has most probably come from our passage. — Ver. 11. *ἐκληρώθημεν*] A D E F G, It. have *ἐκλήθημεν*. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Rück. But Matth. Harless, Tisch. Reiche [Treg. Hofm. Ewald, Holtzm.] have rightly defended the still more considerably attested *Recepta* as the more difficult reading, glossed by *ἐκλήθημεν*. The gloss is to be derived from Rom. viii. 13: *οὓς δὲ προώρισε, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσε*. —Ver. 12. *τῆς* before *δόξης* is, following Griesb., deleted by the more recent editors (except Harless) on preponderating evidence. An addition easily suggested; comp. ver. 14.—Ver. 14. *ὅς*] A B F G L, min. Athan. Cyr. Euthal. Chrys. (in the text) have *ὅ*. So Lachm. and Rück. But *ὅ* was, on account of the preceding *πνεῦμα*, the more easily introduced and retained, since by that means the old opinion, that *ὅς* applies to Christ, was met. — Ver. 15. *τὴν ἀγάπην τήν*] Lachm. has only *τήν*, following A B ℵ* 17, Cyr. (alic.) Jer. Aug. (alic.). A copyist's error, and how easily caused by the repetition of the *τήν*! If the addition had been made from Col. i. 4, *ἣν ἔχετε* would have been inserted instead of the second *τήν*. — Ver. 16. The second *ὑμῶν* is wanting in A B D ℵ, min. Cant. Goth. Hil.; F and G have it after *ποιούμενος*. Deleted by Lachm. and Rück. A defining addition, which was first written in the margin, and then inserted, sometimes before, sometimes after *ποιούμενος*. — Ver. 18. *καρδίας*] Elz. has *διανοίας*, against decisive testimony. An interpretation. — *καί*] is wanting in A B D* F G ℵ* 59, It. Goth. Ambrosiast. Victorin., and is deleted by Lachm. [Tisch. Treg.] and Rück., but came to be more readily left out than added, because the concluding *καί* only comes in afterwards. — Ver. 20. *ἐνήργησεν*] Lachm. reads *ἐνήργηκεν*, after A B, Cyr. Procop.; and rightly so. The aorist, in itself more in current use, was suggested by the aorists following. And the attestation is strong enough, since the vss. and Latin Fathers cannot be taken into account.—*ἐκάθισεν*] Lachm. [Tisch. Treg.] and Rück. read *καθίσας*, following A B ℵ, min. Slav. Vulg. Cyr. utr. Euseb. Procop. Tert. Jer. Ambr. Pel. An attempt to help out the construction. — *οὐρανοῖς*, instead of *ἐπουρανίοις*, though adopted by Lachm., is too feebly attested by B, Victorin. Hilar. — Ver. 23. *τά*] is wanting in Elz., but has been, upon decisive evidence, restored by Bengel, Griesb. and the later editors; comp. ver. 22.

Contents.—After the usual address and apostolic salutation (vv. 1, 2), St. Paul begins with an ascription of praise to God for the salvation in Christ (ver. 3), which he sets forth (*a*) as already lovingly predestined by God in eternity to the praise of His grace (vv. 4, 5); (*b*) as brought about by the death of Christ (vv. 6, 7); then (*c*) as made known according to the purpose of the divine kindness, to unite all in Christ (vv. 8–10); and lastly, (*d*) as really appropriated according to the predestination of God (ver. 11); this latter in respect as well to those who had been Jews (ver. 12) as to those who had been Gentiles (vv. 13, 14), both of whom were destined to the praise of the divine glory.—Wherefore, since the Gentiles also had attained to such happiness, he too, after having heard of their faith and love, ceases not to give thanks for his readers, when making mention of them in his prayers, in order that God might enlighten them by His Spirit concerning the hope to which their calling exalted them, the glory of the future salvation, and the greatness of the divine power in the believers (vv. 15–19), which power they were to recognize by what God had wrought in the case of Christ, whom He had raised from the dead and exalted above all, and had given Him as Lord over all to be Head to the church, which is His body—that which is filled by Him, who filleth all with all (vv. 20–23).

Vv. 1, 2. *Διὰ θελήμ. Θεοῦ*] See on 1 Cor. i. 1. — *τοῖς ἁγίοις*] See on Rom. i. 7. — *καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χ. Ἰ.*] furnishes, with *τοῖς ἁγίοις*, the *completeness* of the conception, hence it is not an epexegesis,[1] but an *appended* element, and *καί* is the closely copulative *and*. Comp. Col. i. 2. It is not, however, the conception of *fidelity* and *perseverance* which is appended,[2] but the notion of *faith* in Christ, since in the address, where the persons are to be designated very distinctly, *τοῖς ἁγίοις* *alone* would not yet characterize the readers expressly as Christians. Comp. Phil. i. 1. — *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*] does not belong to *ἁγίοις* and *πιστοῖς*, so that it would denote the sphere, within which the Christians are saints and believing,[3] for otherwise (comp. on Col. i. 2) *καὶ πιστοῖς* would be quite superfluous and a tame and heavy addition, inasmuch as the notion of *ἅγιος ἐν Χριστῷ* *presupposes* the notion of *πιστὸς ἐν Χριστῷ*; but merely to *πιστοῖς*: *fidem in Christo reponentibus*, *i.e.*, "to those reposing faith in Christ." Comp. i. 15, and see on Mark i. 15; Gal. iii. 26. — Ver. 2. See on Rom. i. 7.

---

[1] Beza, Vorstius, Calovius, and others.

[2] Grotius, Locke, Baumgarten, Rosenmüller, Meier; see, on the other hand, already Calovius.

[3] Harless; comp. Boyd, Storr, *Opusc.* II. p. 121, Meier, Schenkel.

Ver. 3. Εὐλογητός] *praised* (בָּרוּךְ), *sc.* *εἴη*. Comp. Rom. ix. 5 ; 2 Cor. i. 3; Luke i. 68 ; 1 Pet. i. 3 ; 1 Kings xv. 39. It is *prefixed* here, since, as in most doxologies (see on Rom. ix. 5), in keeping with the emotion of the heart which breaks forth in songs of praise, the *emphasis* lies on it. Where the stress in conformity with the context rests upon the *person*, *this* is prefixed, as at 1 Kings x. 9 ; 2 Chron. ix. 8 ; Job i. 21 ; Ps. lxviii. 19, cxii. 1, 2 ; Rom. ix. 5. The second Epistle to the Corinthians begins also with an ascription of praise to God, and the *general character* of that now before us cannot, in view of the general contents of the Epistle (comp. 1 Pet. i. 3 ff.), appear un-Pauline (in opposition to de Wette), especially as the thanksgiving which has reference to the *readers* comes in afterwards in ver. 15 f. — ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ] *God, who at the same time is the Father of Jesus Christ.* See on Rom. xv. 6 ; 1 Cor. xv. 24 ; 2 Cor. xi. 31 ; Theodore of Mopsuestia in Cramer's *Catena.* Jerome, Theodoret, Theophylact, and others, including Michaelis, Koppe, Rückert, Olshausen, Schenkel, Bleek [Ewald, Hofmann, Braune], have incorrectly attached τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν also to ὁ Θεός. It is true, indeed, that there is no objection to the idea "the God of Christ" in itself, and τέ before καί would not be at all necessary, as Harless thinks (see iv. 6 ; 1 Pet. ii. 25, *al.*) ; but against it stands the fact that ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατήρ, even without a genitive, was a stated Christian designation of God (comp. on Rom. xv. 6), in which case πατήρ only, and not Θεός, requires a complementary genitive (v. 20 ; 1 Cor. xv. 24 ; Jas. i. 27, iii. 9). Moreover, the expression *the God of Christ* stands so isolated in the N. T. (see on ver. 17), that we may not attribute to it any such currency, as it must have had, if it were contained in the formula ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ. [See Note II., p. 350.] — ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς] *Aorist:* by the work of redemption. Observe the ingenious correlation of the passive εὐλογητός and the active εὐλογήσας, as well as the *dilogia*, by which the former denotes the blessing in word, and the latter the blessing in *deed* (comp. Rom. xv. 29 ; 2 Cor. ix. 5 f. ; Gal. iii. 8, 9, 14 ; Acts iii. 26). ἡμᾶς applies to the *Christians* generally, not to *Paul*,[1] against which view the unsuitableness of such a thanksgiving of the apostle *for himself* at the head of the Epistle, as well as the actual plurality of persons in the whole context (vv. 4, 11, 12), and κἀγώ, ver. 15, are decisive. — ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ] instrumental : *by His imparting to us every spiritual blessing ;*[2] *none* has He withheld from us. This, however, is not to be explained as *blessing, which concerns our spirit*,[3] but : *proceeding from the Holy Spirit*, because the distinctively *Christian* benefits are meant, and these are χαρίσματα. Comp. Rom. i. 11, xv. 29 ; 1 Cor. xii. 1 ff. This blessing is wrought by *God* from *heaven* through the communication of the Spirit (ver. 13 ; Gal. iii. 5 ; 1 Cor. xii. 6, and elsewhere), hence *God is* praised for it. We may add that a contrast to the earthly benefits promised to the Jews in the Old Testament,[4] or to the typical blessings of the Jews and the empty possessions of the Gentiles,[5] is foreign to the context. Paul denotes the matter in a purely positive form *as it is, according to its characteristic nature;* hence there is not in πάσῃ any contrast to merely *sporadic* blessings *in the O. T.* The εὐλογία consists in the most varied expressions, as in grace, truth, peace, joy, love, hope, consolation, patience, and all Christian virtues as the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. v. 22 ; Rom. v. 1 ff.). Compare πᾶν ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν, Philem. 6. — ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις] local : *in the heavenly regions, in heaven.* Comp. ver. 20, ii. 6, iii. 10, vi. 12. Against the instrumental rendering, according to which it is understood, as a more precise definition of the spiritual blessing, of the heavenly *possessions,*[1] we may urge, not the article,[2]—which would very appropriately denote the *category,* — but the fact, that Paul has not added ἀγαθοῖς or χαρίσμασι, just because in our Epistle ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις is constantly a designation of *place.*[3] The local ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις is *referred,* either to *God,* so that heaven appears as the *seat* where the divine blessing is *being prepared*[4]—but how idle and self-evident that would be ! or to ἡμεῖς, so that heaven, as the seat of our πολίτευμα (Phil. iii. 20), would be the *scene* of the divine blessing. So Pelagius, Beza (who leaves a choice between the two views), Grotius (who says that the blessings place us *et spe et jure in coelo,* "both by hope and right in heaven"), Baumgarten, Koppe, Rückert, and others. The aorist would not be at variance with this view, since the matter might be set forth proleptically in accordance with an ideal mode of looking at it (comp. ii. 6). But the whole explanation is far-fetched and opposed to the context ; for πνευματικῇ shows that Paul has not thought of our having received this blessing in the heavenly πολίτευμα, seeing that the Holy Spirit is received *on earth* as the present *earnest* of the heavenly heritage (vv. 13, 14). Accordingly, the third reference remains the only correct one, under which ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις is attached as a local definition to εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ : *with every spiritual benefit in heaven,* so that, because the Holy Spirit is in heaven, as is God Himself ὁ τὴν κατοικίαν ἐπουράνιον ἔχων (2 Macc. iii. 39), the blessings also of the Spirit are regarded as to be found in heaven and brought down thence to us. See Heb. vi. 4. [See Note III., p. 350 seq.] —ἐν Χριστῷ] for *in Christ* lay the ground of that εὐλογεῖν accomplished in our case ; not out of Christ, but in Him lay the cause that God blessed us with every spiritual blessing, since His act of redemption is the *causa meritoria,* "meritorious cause," of this divine bestowal of blessing. Comp. ver. 4.

---

[1] Koppe.

[2] Comp. *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 722 : εὐλογ. ἐν ἀγαθοῖς.

[3] Erasmus, Michaelis, Morus, Rosenmüller ; Koppe and Rückert are undecided.

[4] Grotius and others, including recently Holzhausen.

[5] Schöttgen.

---

[1] These would not be possessions, which have reference to the heavenly life, but possessions *which are to be found in heaven* and are imparted to us. For ἐπουράνιος always means "*to be found in heaven.*" See Wetstein, I. p. 447; Bleek on Heb. iii. 1, p. 375. Comp. τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ver. 10. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Luther, Castalio, Piscator, Vorstius, Homberg, Michaelis, Zachariae, Morus, Flatt, Bleek, and others.

[2] In opposition to Rückert, Harless, Olshausen.

[3] The expression ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, which occurs five times in this Epistle and nowhere else in the N. T., is surprising. In the case of any writer, no doubt, a phrase not in current use with him at other times may be accidentally and temporarily suggested to him, the use of which he involuntarily appropriates and soon again as involuntarily abandons ; yet it remains a surprising fact that the expression ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις is not also used in the Epistle to the Colossians written at the same time, where there was no lack of opportunity (i. 5, 16, 20) for the use of the expression, although the two Epistles exhibit so much verbal affinity.

[4] Beza, Boyd, Weiss.

Ver. 4. Further amplification of ὁ εὐλογήσας κ.τ.λ. on to ver. 14. See the contents. — καθώς] *even as*, denotes that that εὐλογεῖν has taken place *in conformity with* the fact that, etc., and is consequently *argumentative ;* see on 1 Cor. i. 6 ; John xiii. 34. — ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς] *He has chosen us* (from the collective mass of men) *for Himself* (*sibi*). Comp. 1 Cor. i. 27 ; Rom. ix. 11, xi. 5, 7, 28 ; John xv. 19 ; 1 Pet. ii. 9 f. Entirely without reason Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, I. p. 223, denies that ἐκλέγεσθαι here has reference to *others not chosen*, and asserts that it applies *only* to that which we, in the absence of election, should not have become. This is according to the very *notion* of the word quite impossible. Ἐκλέγεσθαι *always* has, and must *of logical necessity* have, a reference to *others*, to whom the chosen would, without the ἐκλογή, still belong. Even in Acts vi. 5, xiii. 17 ; 1 Tim. v. 21 ; Ex. xviii. 25 ; Deut. iv. 37, it sets forth the distinctive separation from the remaining mass, just as also Christ, as one who is chosen out from all that is man, is called the ἐκλεκτός of God (Luke ix. 35, xxiii. 35). — ἐν αὐτῷ] for in nothing else and in no one else than *in Christ*, whose future work of redemption God has foreknown and decreed from eternity (Acts xv. 18 ; Rom. xvi. 25 ; 2 Tim. i. 9 ; 1 Pet. i. 20, *al.*), lay the ground, that the electing grace (Rom. xi. 5) chose us (comp. iii. 11) ; hence God had, as respected the subjects to be affected by the election, to deal, not in any arbitrary manner, but according to His πρόγνωσις, "foreknowledge," of the same (*praecognovit credituros, i.e.*, he foreknew who would believe). See on Rom. viii. 29. Christ is not, however, here conceived of as Himself chosen God, and we as *included in Him* (ἐν αὐτῷ), as Hofmann, p. 229, thinks ; but, as the more precise explanation in ver. 5 shows, the divine act of our election has in Christ its *determining ground*, so that to us by this act there is assigned and allotted no other than the salvation to be gained *through Christ* (who in the fulness of the times was out of His pre-existence to be sent as Incarnate and was to accomplish the work of salvation). *Apart from* this connection of the divine election with Christ we should *not* be chosen ; but *in Christ* lay for God the *causa meritoria*, "meritorious cause," of our election.[1] The reference of ἐν αὐτῷ to God[2] is to be rejected on account of the utter superfluousness of this definition, and on account of the preceding ἐν Χριστῷ. — πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου] thus before all time, already in eternity. Comp. Col. i. 15 ff. ; 2 Thess. ii. 13 ; Matt. xxv. 34 ; also 1 Cor. ii. 7 ; 2 Tim. i. 9. The *expression* is nowhere else found in Paul ; but see Matt. xiii. 35 ; Luke xi. 50 ; John xvii. 24 ; Heb. iv. 3 ; 1 Pet. i. 20 ; Rev. xiii. 8. [See Note IV., p. 351.]— εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους κ.τ.λ.] Infinitive of the design : *in order that we should be*, etc.[3] The predicates ἅγιος and ἄμωμος (*blameless*, Herod.

---

[1] Beyschlag (*Christol. d. N. T.* p. 141) finds in ἐν αὐτῷ the thought, "that the divinely conceived prototypes of perfected believers are from eternity posited by God in the One Prototype of humanity acceptable unto Him, as the countless multiplications of the same, to be thereupon brought through the historically realized One Prototype to their realization and perfection." In opposition to this view we may simply urge the context, according to which ἐν αὐτῷ denotes Christ as the personal ground of the ἐκλογή made before all time, *in so far as He, as Reconciler, is the bearer of the divine grace*, vv. 6, 7.

[2] Al. Morus, Holzhausen : *with Himself, in His heart.*

[3] See Winer, p. 298 f.

ii. 177 ; Theoc. xviii. 25) exhaust the conception positively and negatively.[1] It is not, however, to be explained of the holiness conditioned by *morality and virtue*,[2] in which case reservations on account of human imperfection are often arbitrarily inserted, nor is it referred, as by Rückert, to the *ideal* point of view of the apostle ; but rather of the holiness and blamelessness brought about *through the atoning death of Christ* by means of the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ thereby attained (Rom. iii. 21 ff., v. 1 ff., viii. 1, 33 ff. ; 1 Cor. vi. 11 ; Heb. x. 10, 14, 29), in favor of which the very εἶναι (not γίνεσθαι) and the whole context are decisive (vv. 5, 6, 7). We may add that, if the emphasis with which our Epistle brings into prominence the *holiness of the Church* (comp. v. 27) is to be held as betraying the standpoint of the second century,[3] for which especial reference is made to iii. 10, 31, with equal reason the like suspicion may be thrown even on the most fully acknowledged Epistles (such as the Epistles to the Corinthians). [See Note V., p. 351 seq.] —κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ] before God's eyes, *judice Deo* (Col. ii. 14 ; Rom. iii. 20, iv. 5). It is *God's judgment*, which has made the reconciled holy and blameless, and that by imputation of faith unto righteousness ; thereupon He gives to them every εὐλογία πνευματική, ver. 3. The reference of αὐτός successively recurring to *different* subjects cannot surprise us ;[4] and so it is not to be written αὑτοῦ (as Harless still does), but αὐτοῦ, from the standpoint of the author.[5] —ἐν ἀγάπῃ] is attached by many to ver. 4, so that it is connected either with ἐξελέξατο,[6] but in how isolated and awkward a way ! or with εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους κ.τ.λ.,[7] so that ἐν ἀγάπῃ would be the ground, or rather the element (*evangelii* τὸ πᾶν, "all of the gospel," says Grotius, "lies in love"), of the holiness and blamelessness. But this is not compatible with the correct explanation of ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους, *as a state brought about by the* ἱλαστήριον *of Christ*, according to which, not ἐν ἀγάπῃ, but ἐν πίστει, would have been a definition of the element of holiness in keeping with the context. Hence the connection with προορίσας, ver. 5, remains as the only correct one.[8] The only one of the objections made to this view which is plausible is that of Matthies and Meier, that the following κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ would render the preceding ἐν ἀγάπῃ in this connection superfluous. But see on ver. 5.

Ver. 5. *Love* was the disposition of God, in which He through this our election *predestined* us to υἱοθεσία. Hence this divine motive is prefixed with emphasis, quite in keeping with the character of ascription of praise marking the discourse. Consequently: *in that He in love predestined us.* Homberg has indeed conceived the relation of the time of *προορίσας* to *ἐξελέξατο* as: "*postquam* nos praedestinavit adoptandos, elegit etiam nos, ut simus sancti," "after he predestinated us for adoption, he elected us to be holy;" but the usual view correctly conceives *προορίσας* as coincident in point of time, and accomplished simultaneously with *ἐξελέξατο*, so that it is regarded as the *modus*, "mode," of the latter (see on *γνωρίσας*, ver. 9). For the *predestination* (the *προορίζειν*) is never elsewhere distinguished from the *election* as something preceding it; it rather substantially coincides with it (hence at Rom. viii. 29 *only* the expression *προώρισε* is used, while in viii. 33 *only* *ἐκλεκτοί* are mentioned), and only the *πρόγνωσις*, "foreknowledge," is *prior*, Rom. *l.c.*[1] It is, we may add, purely arbitrary to distinguish *ἐξελέξατο* and *προορίσας*, so that the former should apply to *individuals*, the latter to the *whole.*[2] Both verbs have in fact the same objects (*ἡμᾶς*, which denotes the *persons*); see on Rom. viii. 29. [See Note VI., p. 352.] — The *προ* in *προορίσας*, "*beforehand*," points to the *future realization.* Certainly the predestination has taken place *before the creation of the world* (ver. 4); but this is not expressed by *προ*, which rather looks always towards the future setting in of the thing predestined. See Rom. viii. 29; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. i. 11; Acts iv. 28; Heliod. p. 298, 14, p. 266, 15; Sopater in Walz, *Rhet.* V. p. 152, 20. — *εἰς υἱοθεσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς αὐτόν*] are to be taken closely together: *unto adoption through Jesus Christ in reference to Him,*—that is, He has destined us *to stand in the relation of those assumed as children through mediation of Jesus Christ to Him* (to God). Comp. Rom. viii. 29. That *υἱοθεσία* is nowhere merely *childship,*[3] but *adoption,*[4] see on Rom. vii. 15; Gal. iv. 5. *υἱοθεσία* is never predicated of *Christ Himself;* for He is the *born* Son of God (Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 4), who procured for His own the *assumption* into the place of children (whereby they became *de jure* His brethren, Rom. viii. 29). The pre-eminence of Christ is therefore *essential*, not merely *prototypal*, as of the head of humanity;[5] He is the *μονογενής*. Through adoption believers have passed out (comp. Rom. vii. 24 f.) of their natural state, in which by sin they were liable to the wrath of God (ii. 3), and have entered into the state of reconciliation, in which, through the mediation of the reconciling death of Christ (vv. 6, 7), by means of the faith in it which was counted to them for righteousness (Gal. iii. 26; Rom. iv. 5, 23 f.) they have forgiveness of sins, and are heirs of the Messianic blessedness (ver. 14; Gal. iv. 7; Rom. viii. 10, 11, 17), as a guarantee of which the Holy Spirit is given to them (ver. 14; Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 16).— *εἰς αὐτόν*] does not apply to *Christ,*[6] since Christ is *mediator* of the adoption, and this is a *relation to God.* This simple sense of *reference toward* is to be maintained, and we must not introduce either *ad gloriam gratiae suae*, "to the glory of his grace,"[1] or "bringing our race εἰς αὐτὸν."[2] At variance with linguistic usage, Beza, Calvin, and Calixtus take it for ἐν ἑαυτῷ, and discover in it the independence of the divine προορισμός ; and Grotius, Wolf, Baumgarten, Koppe, Holzhausen, Meier hold it as equivalent to *sibi*, לוֹ, *himself* ("as children, who rightly belong to Him as His own," Meier). Comp. also on Col. i. 20. — We may add that here, too, we must not write[3] *αὑτόν*, but *αὐτόν*. [See Note VII., p. 352.] Comp. above on κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ. — κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ (not αὑτοῦ) : *conformably to the pleasure of His will*, just as it was the purpose of His will. Comp. Matt. xi. 26 ; Luke x. 21. So Vulgate, Erasmus, Calvin, Bengel, Flatt, and others, including Rückert, de Wette, Bleek. It may also signify : according to the *benevolence* of His will.[4] But *this* notion is already and more strongly contained in ἐν ἀγάπῃ ; and the element which is here meant, of *free self-determination*, independent of all human desert, as regulative of the προορίζειν, is clearly pointed to in the parallel by ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ. Comp. also ver. 11 ; 2 Tim. i. 9.

---

[1] Comp. Plut. *Pericl.* p. 173 D : βιός . . . καθαρὸς καὶ ἀμίαντος, and see on Col. i. 22 ; Eph. v. 27.

[2] Chrysostom, Theophylact, Calvin, Piscator, Grotius, Calixtus, and many others, including Flatt, Rückert, Matthies, Meier, Schenkel.

[3] See Schwegler, in Zeller's *Jahrb.* 1844, p. 382.

[4] Winer, p. 135.

[5] Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 276 ; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 2. 49.

[6] Oecumenius, Thomas, Flacius, Olearius, Baumgarten, Flatt, and others.

[7] Vulgate, Ambrosiaster, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Grotius, Wolf, Wetstein, and others, including Rückert,—but with hesitation,—Matthies, Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius.

[8] So the Peshito, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Augustine, Estius (but with hesitation), Bengel, Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, and others, including Lachmann, Harless, Olshausen, de Wette, Tischendorf, Schenkel, Bleek.

---

[1] Comp. Lampsing, *Pauli de praedestinat. decreta*, Leovard. 1858, p. 70. See on this use of the aorist participle, Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 774; Bernhardy, p. 383; Winer, p. 321.

[2] Schenkel.

[3] As Meier and Bleek still take it here, following Usteri.

[4] Even the old theocratic *υἱοθεσία* was *adoption;* for the Jews were as such, and not as men generally, the chosen and peculiar people to whom the Messiah was promised. See on Rom. ix. 4.

[5] In opposition to Beyschlag, *Christol. d. N. T.* p. 222 f.

[6] Anselm, Thomas, Castalio, Vorstius, Menochius, Cornelius à Lapide, and others, including de Wette.

Remark.—Predestination is not made dependent on any sort of *causa meritoria*, "meritorious cause," on the part of man (comp. ver. 11), but is simply an act of free divine kindness, whose determination has its *causa impulsiva*, "impelling cause," only in Christ ; so that, in the case of the predestined subjects, faith is set forth as the *causa apprehendens*, "apprehending cause," of the salvation destined for them κατὰ πρόγνωσιν (Rom. viii. 29) ; and with this Rom. ix., when rightly apprehended, agrees. The conditions mentally supplied by expositors (as *e.g.*, Grotius, who finds in our passage "decretum ejus, quod Deus facere vult, *si et homines faciant quod debent*," "his decree that God wishes to act, *provided men also do what they ought*;" comp. already Jerome) remove the relation out of the sphere of the divine εὐδοκία τοῦ θελήματος into that of dependence on human self-choice, and consequently into the domain of the accidental. The notion of *absolute* decree, however, breaks down before the πρόγνωσις as the necessary premiss of the divine ἐκλογή—a premiss, which doubtless involves the necessity of morally restricting the *truncus aut lapis*, block or "stone," of the Formula Concordiae (comp. Luthardt, *Lehre vom freien Willen*, p. 272).

Ver. 6. As love was the *disposition serving as motive for the divine predestination* (ver. 5), so is the glorifying of the divine love (which, however, is here designated in accordance with its distinctive peculiarity, because it refers *to sinners*, ii. 1 ff., as *grace*) its divinely conceived ultimate aim, not, as Grotius would have it, *consequens aliud*, "something consequent." Comp. 2 Cor. i. 20 ; Phil. i. 11. — εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ (not αὑτοῦ) means neither *to the glorious praise of His grace*,[5] nor *to the praise of*

---

[1] Piscator ; comp. Schenkel.

[2] Theophylact.

[3] With Beza, Stephanus, Mill, Griesbach, Knapp, Meier, and others.

[4] See, generally, Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 369 ff. So Harless, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, following older expositors.

[5] Grotius, Estius.

His glorious grace,[1] the one of which is just as arbitrary as the other ; but : *to the praise of the glory of His grace.* The *quality* of the grace, its glory—its greatness laudably evincing itself—is brought into prominence as the object of the praise to be bestowed on it.[2] Bengel already in his day aptly distinguished the notions : "Primum nascitur laus gratiae," ver. 7, "inde laus gloriae," "the praise of grace arises first, then the praise of glory."—δόξης *without the article* may not surprise us on account of the genitival definition that follows. See Winer, p. 118 f. —ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἠγαπ.] ἧς is attracted by the preceding τῆς χάριτος,[3] instead of ἥν.[4] Χαριτόω means: *gratia aliquem afficere*, "to treat any one with grace ;" and, according as the χάρις is conceived of subjectively as *love-worthiness*, or objectively as the *divine grace*, the sense may either be : *to make love-worthy*, as Chrysostom[5] and his followers,[6] Cornelius à Lapide, and many Roman Catholics,[7] have taken it, understanding thereby not merely the reconciliation, but also the positive sanctifying, the *justitia inhaerens*, "inherent righteousness ;" or : *to grant grace* (as it is taken usually). In the former sense,[8] the word occurs, Niceph. *Prog.* ii. 2 ; Symm. *Ps.* xvii. 28 ; Ecclus. xviii. 17 ; also Ecclus. ix. 8 in Cod. A ; and Clem. Alex. *Paed.* iii. 11 ; in the latter sense, in Luke i. 28 ; *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 698. The latter is here decidedly correct, since the preceding τῆς χάριτος, especially with ἧς as the reading, permits no deviation from that meaning, just as ver. 7 sets forth simply the work of *pardoning grace.* — ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ] Christ as the υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, "the son of his love," Col. i. 13 (comp. Matt. iii. 17), is κατ' ἐξοχή, "pre-eminently," the *beloved* of God, and *in Him* has God shown us grace, *i.e.*, in the fact that He gave Him up to death for us (ver. 7), He has brought home to us His grace. Comp. ii. 13 ; Rom. viii. 39 ; 2 Cor. v. 19. The designation of Christ by ὁ ἠγαπήμενος makes us feel the *greatness* of the divine grace. Comp. Rom. viii. 32, v. 8 ff. ; John iii. 16 ; 1 John iv. 9 f.

Ver. 7. More precise elucidation, on the basis of experience (ἔχομεν), of what had just been said, ἐχαρίτ. ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἠγαπ. — ἐν ᾧ] so that *in Him* our possession of the redemption has its ground. He it is, without whose person and work we should not have been redeemed ; χωρὶς Χριστοῦ (ii. 12), no ἀπολύτρωσις. Comp. Rom. iii. 24. The *relative* has, as is often the case,[9] *argumentative* significance. Comp. here especially iii. 12. — τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν] the *redemption*, namely, from God's wrath and penalties, which before our entrance into faith we had incurred through sin (Rom. i. 18, iii. 23, v. 5 ff., vii. 7 ff. ; Eph. ii. 3, v. 6, *al.*), as those who were under the dominion of the devil (Col. i. 13; Acts xxvi. 18). The purchase-price (1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23; Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45) through which Christ, in voluntary obedience to God's gracious counsel, accomplished this ἀπολύτρωσις, was His blood, which He shed as an ἱλαστήριον, "a propitiation," for the benefit of men (Rom. iii. 25, v. 8, 9; 2 Cor. v. 21; Col. i. 21, ii. 13 f.). On ἀπολύτρωσις, as the effect of the atoning death, in which case the blood of Christ is always conceived of as the *purchase-price*, see Rom. iii. 24. — *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ*] *by means of His blood*, a more precise definition of the preceding ἐν ᾧ. Paul might have written ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ (ii. 13); but he in general prefers an interchange of prepositions (comp. 2 Cor. iii. 11; Rom. iii. 30; Gal. ii. 16; Philem. 5), to which he was here specially led by his epexegetic purpose (comp. iii. 12; 1 Thess. iii. 7). — *τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων*] apposition to τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, the essence of which is the *forgiveness* of *sins* obtained on account of the death of Christ. As to the distinction between πάρεσις (Rom. iii. 25) and ἄφεσις (used by Paul also in Col. i. 14), see on Rom. iii. 25. — *τῶν παραπτωμάτων* denotes always the *actual individual sins* (ii. 1 ff.; and see on Rom. v. 20); hence Paul has not mentally included a forgiveness of inborn sinfulness.[1] [See Note VIII., p. 352.] — *κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ*] is not to be resolved into an adjective ("gratia liberalissima," "by his most liberal grace," Koppe); but *the riches, i.e., the great fulness*,[2] of the divine grace is that, in consequence of which we have in Christ the redemption. It is to be noted that here, as well as in ver. 6, the reference to the divine grace serves to wind up one element of the discourse, and (by ἧς) to annex another. As to πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος (ii. 7, iii. 16), see on Rom. ii. 4. We may add that Lachmann, Rückert, Tischendorf [Westcott and Hort] have the form τὸ πλοῦτος, following A B D* E (?) ℵ* min., to which also F G fall to be added with the transcriber's error τοῦ πλοῦτος; and rightly.[3]

---

[1] Luther, Castalio, Beza, and most expositors, including Morus, Koppe, Flatt, Holzhausen, Meier.

[2] Comp. Bernhardy, p. 53 f.; Held, *ad Timol.* p. 368.

[3] χάριν χαριτοῦν is conceived of as ἀγάπην ἀγαπᾶν, ii. 4 ; John xvii. 26 ; comp. Dem. 306, 28 : χάριτας χαρίζεσθαι.

[4] Comp. iv. 1 ; and see on 2 Cor. i. 4 ; Hom. *Il.* xxii. 649 ; Arist. *Pl.* 1044 : τῆς ὕβρεος ἧς ὑβρίζομαι.

[5] Chrysostom says : Just as if one were to make a sick or famished man into a beautiful youth, so has God made our soul beautiful and love-worthy for the angels and all saints and for Himself.

[6] Comp. also Luther.

[7] Including Bisping.

[8] See Wetstein, I. p. 651.

[9] See, generally, Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phil.* p. 195 f.; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 371.

Ver. 8. *Ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς*] ἧς stands by attraction (comp. ver. 6), not for ᾗ,[4] so that ἐπερίσσ. would be intransitive, — for the attraction of the dative, rare even in classic authors,[5] is not found in the N. T., not even in the passages adduced by Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 247, — but for ἥν, so that ἐπερίσσ. is *transitive* (2 Cor. iv. 15, ix. 8; 1 Thess. iii. 12): *which He has made abundant*, has shown in an exceedingly high degree (ἀφθόνως ἐξέχεε, "ungrudgingly shed," Theophylact), *toward us*. If, with Calvin and Beza,[6] we should not assume any attraction at all, but should take the genitive as at Luke xv. 17, there would result the sense, unsuitable to what follows (γνωρίσας κ.τ.λ.): *of which He had superabundance towards us*. — *ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει*] is not[7] to be attached to γνωρίσας, because it would thus, like ἐν ἀγάπῃ in ver. 5, denote the *attribute of God* operative in the γνωρίζειν, which, on account of πάσῃ (see below), is not admissible. If, again, we should, with Chrysostom,[1] regard it as the *state of men* brought about by *γνωρίσας κ.τ.λ.*, this would be forced, and, as concerns the sense, there might be urged against it the circumstance that, in the making known of the divine mystery, Paul had to set forth, not the divine display of grace *in itself* (this was given in the *work* of redemption, vv. 6, 7), but the *display* of grace *as revealed.* Hence it was necessary that there should be added to *ἧς ἐπερίσσ. εἰς ἡμ.* a definition, and this is *ἐν πάσῃ σοφ. κ. φρον.*: *which he has displayed abundantly towards us by every kind of wisdom and discernment* (with which He endowed us, comp. Col. i. 9), in that He made known to us, etc. Observe here withal the *climax*, in which, rising from the simple *ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς*, ver. 6, the apostle now, at this further display of grace, says : *ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς.* Rückert,[2] although connecting it with *ἧς ἐπερίσσ. εἰς ἡμ.*, incorrectly holds the *divine* wisdom to be meant, and takes the sense to be, that God has with highest wisdom and discernment dispensed His grace over us. Not only would this introduce here something remote from the point,—since in the whole context Paul is commending only *grace* as such, and not any other attribute along with it,—but the words themselves are opposed to it, not indeed by *φρονήσει* in itself, which[3] might be used also of *God* (1 Kings iii. 28 ; Prov. iii. 19 ; Jer. x. 12), but certainly by *πάσῃ.* For *πᾶσα σοφία* does not mean *summa sapientia*, "the highest wisdom," but *every kind of wisdom*, which, according to a popular mode of expression, like our "*all possible wisdom*,"[4] can be said only of *men.* The *πολυποίκιλος σοφία*, iii. 10, is not analogous,[5] but denotes the *absolute* wisdom according to its *manifold modes of manifestation.*[6] [See Winer, § 18 : 4] —*καὶ φρονήσει*] Comp. 1 Kings iv. 29 : *ἔδωκε κύριος φρόνησιν τῷ Σαλωμὼν καὶ σοφίαν πολλήν* ; Dan. ii. 21 : *διδοὺς σοφίαν τοῖς σοφοῖς καὶ φρόνησιν τοῖς εἰδόσι σύνεσιν* ; Joseph. *Antt.* ii. 5. 7, viii. 7. 5. *Φρόνησις* is an aptitude, which proceeds from wisdom (*ἡ δὲ σοφία ἀνδρὶ τίκτει φρόνησιν*, Prov. x. 23), in connection with which the distinction is to be noted, that *σοφία* is the general notion[7] which embraces the *collective* activity of the mind as directed to divine aims only to be achieved by moral means (comp. on Col. i. 9) ; whereas *φρόνησις* denotes the more special notion of the morally determined *intelligence*, the *insight of practical reason* regulating the dispositions *ἐπιστήμη ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν*, "understanding of good and evil," Plato, *Def.* p. 411 D ; *ἕξις ἀληθὴς μετὰ λόγου πρακτικὴ περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀγαθὰ κ. κακά*, "A true practical habit exercised by the reason with respect to things good and evil to man," Arist. *Eth.* vi. 5. 4). See, especially, also Cic. *Off.* i. 43. Comp. on *φρόνησις*, which Paul has not elsewhere, Luke i. 17 ; Beck, *bibl. Seelenl.* p. 62.

---

[1] Olshausen.

[2] Codex 17 has τὸ πλῆθος.

[3] See on 2 Cor. viii. 2, Remark; and see Winer, p. 64.

[4] Camerarius, Calvin, Piscator, Erasmus, Schmid.

[5] Krüger, *Gramm.* 51. 10. 3, and *Grammat. Unters.* III. p. 274 f.

[6] Comp. also Holzhausen.

[7] With Chrysostom, Jerome, Theodoret, Homberg, Baumgarten, Semler, Michaelis, Griesbach, Koppe, Holzhausen, Scholz.

Ver. 9. *In that He has made known to us the mystery of His will.* The *aorist* participle signifies an action coincident and completed at the same time with *ἐπερίσσ.* See on i. 5. —*ἡμῖν*] applies, as in the whole connection, to *Christians generally;* but in this case the extraordinary kinds of making known, which *individuals* among them had experienced (such as Paul himself, who was instructed δι' ἀποκαλύψεως, iii. 3; Gal. i. 12), are left out of account. — τὸ μυστήρ. τοῦ θελήμ. αὐτοῦ] τοῦ θελήμ. is an objective genitive. And the mystery with which the divine will is occupied, is *the counsel of redemption accomplished through Christ,* not in so far as it is in itself incomprehensible for the understanding, but in so far as, while formed from eternity, it was until the announcement of the gospel hidden in God, and veiled and unknown to men. See Rom. xvi. 25 f.; Eph. iii. 4 f., 9, vi. 19; Col. i. 26. By the prophets the mystery was not disclosed, but the disclosure of it was merely *predicted;* here at the proclamation of the gospel the prophetic predictions became the *means* of its being disclosed, Rom. xvi. 25 f. — κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκ. αὐτοῦ] belongs not to τὸ μυστ. τοῦ θελ. αὐτ.,[1] in which case it would stand in a tautologic relation to τοῦ θελ. αὐτ., but rather to γνωρίσας κ.τ.λ., stating that God has accomplished the making known *in pursuance of His free self-determination.* Comp. on ver. 5. — ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ] would be in itself redundant, but serves for the attaching of that which follows; hence no comma is to be placed after αὐτῷ. It is not, however, to be written as αὐτῷ,[2] since here the αὐτός cannot appear as the third person, as would be the case if the text had run in some such form as κατὰ τὴν ποόθεσιν αὐτοῦ, and as was previously the case with the thrice occurring αὐτοῦ. If αὐτῷ were to be read, a subject different from God would be meant; as, indeed, Chrysostom and his successors, as well as Luther, Calovius, Bengel, and others, in reality understood it of *Christ,* although the latter only comes in again at ver. 10, and that by name. — προέθετο] *set before Himself* (Rom. i. 13), *purposed* (namely, to accomplish it) *in Himself, i.e., in His heart* (anthropopathic designation). This purpose, too (πρόθεσις, ver. 11), is to be conceived as formed before the creation of the world; without this idea, however, being expressed by προ, which is not even to be taken temporally, but *locally* (to set *before* oneself), comp. on προχειρίζομαι, Acts. iii. 20. There is incorrectness, for the very reason that ἐν αὐτῷ does not apply to Christ, in the translation of Luther (comp. Vulgate): "and has *brought forth* [*herfürgebracht*] the same by Him," though προέθ. in itself might have this meaning. See on Rom. iii. 25.

---

[1] Comp. Michaelis and others.

[2] Comp. Jerome, Castalio, de Wette, and others.

[3] In opposition to Harless and Schenkel.

[4] Theile, *ad Jacob.* p. 7.

[5] In opposition to de Wette.

[6] [See Winer, § 18 : 4.]

[7] *ἐπιστήμη θείων τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων*, "understanding of divine as well as of human things," Sext. Emp. *adv. phys.* i. 13.

Ver. 10. Εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώμ. τῶν καιρ.] *Unto the dispensation of the fulfilling of the times,* belongs not to γνωρίσας,[3] but to the immediately preceding ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ, which is inserted solely with a view to attach to it εἰς οἰκον. κ.τ.λ.; and εἰς does not stand for ἐν,[4] but denotes what God in forming that purpose *had in view,* and is thus telic: *with a design to.*[5] With the *temporal* rendering, *usque ad,*[6] we should have to take προέθετο in a pregnant sense, and to supply mentally: "*consilio secretum et abditum esse voluit,*" "He wished it to be secret and concealed in his counsel,"[7] which, however, with the former explanation is superfluous, and hence is arbitrary here, although it would in itself be admissible (Winer, p. 577). — οἰκονομία] *house-management* (Luke xvi. 2), used also in the ethico-theocratic sense (1 Tim. i. 4), and specially of the functions of the apostolic office (1 Cor. ix. 17; Col. i. 25), here signifies *regulation*, *disposition*, *arrangement* in general, in which case the conception of an οἰκονόμος has receded into the background.[1] — The πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν, *id quo impleta sunt tempora*, "that wherein times are fulfilled" (comp. on iii. 19) is not *in substance* different from τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, Gal. iv. 4; nevertheless, in our passage the pre-Messianic period running on from the beginning is *conceived of* not as unity, as at Gal. *l.c.*, but according to its different sections of time marked off by different epochs, the last of which closes with the setting in of the Messianic work of redemption, and which thus with this setting in become full (like a measure), so that nothing more is lacking to make up the time as a whole, of which they are the parts. This πλήρωμα is consequently not, in general, *tempus justum*, "the right time,"[2] but the *fulness* of the times, *i.e.*, that point of time, by the setting in of which the pre-Messianic ages are made full,[3] that is, are closed as complete.[4] Fritzsche[5] conceives it otherwise, holding that τὸ πλήρωμα is *plenitas*, "fulness," the abstract of πλήρης, hence πλ. τ. κ. *plenum tempus*, "the full time," οἱ πλήρεις καιροί. But while πλήρωμα doubtless signifies *impletio*, "fulfilling," like πλήρωσις, in Ezek. v. 2; Dan. x. 3; Soph. *Trach.* 1203; Eurip. *Tro.* 824, it never denotes the *being full*. — *Now, in what way is the genitive-relation* οἰκονομία τοῦ πληρώματος *to be understood?* A genitive of the object[6] τοῦ πληρώμ cannot be, inasmuch as it may doubtless be said of the πλήρωμα τῶν καιρ. as a point of time fixed by God: *it comes* (Gal. iv. 4), but not: *it is arranged*, οἰκονομεῖται. Harless takes the genitive as *epexegetic*. But a *point of time* (πλήρ. τ. καιρ.) cannot logically be an appositional more precise definition of a *fact* (οἰκονομία). The genitive is rightly taken as expressing the *characteristic* (temporal) *peculiarity*, as by Calovius: "dispensatio *propria plenitudini temporum*," "the dispensation peculiar to the fulness of the times." Comp. Rückert. Just as κρίσις μεγάλης ἡμέρας, Jude 6. Hence: *with a view to the dispensation to be established at the setting in of the fulness of the times.* For, ὅτε ἦλθε τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, "when the fulness of the time came God sent forth his Son," Gal. *l.c.*, and on His emergence πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός, "the time is fulfilled," Mark i. 15. There was *no* need that the article should stand before οἰκον. just because of the complete definition contained in the following genitive.

---

[1] Bleek.

[2] As by Lachmann, Harless, Tischendorf [Westcott and Hort, Eng. Rev. Version].

[3] Bengel.

[4] Vulgate and several Fathers, also Beza, Piscator, and others.

[5] [See Winer, § 49.]

[6] Erasmus, Calvin, Bucer, Estius, Er. Schmid, Michael., and others.

[7] Erasmus. *Paraphr.*

---

[1] Comp. iii. 2; Xen. *Cyr.* v. 3. 25; Plut. *Pomp.* 50; frequently in Polyb. (see Schweighaeuser, *Lex. Polyb.* p. 402; comp. also 2 Macc. iii. 14; 3 Macc. iii. 2; Act. Thom. 57).

[2] Morus: at its time.

[3] The apostolic idea of the πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν excludes the conception of a series of worlds without beginning or end (Rothe). See Gess, *v. d. Pers. Chr.* p. 170 ff.

[4] Comp. Herod. iii. 22: ὀγδώκοντα δ' ἔτεα ζόης πλήρωμα ἀνδρὶ μακρότατον προκέεσθαι, "eighty years are appointed as the longest fulness of life to man" (implementum vitae longissimum, *i.e.*, *longissimum tempus*, *quo impletur vita*, "the longest fulness of life, *i.e.*, the longest time in which life is fulfilled"), and see on Gal. iv. 4; Wetstein on Mark i. 15.

[5] In *Thesauri quo sacrae N. T. glossae illustr. specim.*, Rostock 1839, p. 25, and *ad Rom.* II. p. 473.

[6] Menochius, Storr, Baumgarten-Crusius.

Comp. on ver. 6. It would only be required, if we should have *mentally to supply* to οἰκονομίαν a genitival definition, and thus to make it an independent idea, as is done by many,[1] who explain it as *administrationem gratiae*, "an administration of grace,"—a view which is erroneous, just because a genitive already *stands beside it*, although οἰκονομία τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν, *taken together*, *is* the Christian dispensation of grace. This genitival definition standing alongside of it also prevents us from taking, with Luther, εἰς οἰκονομίαν (*sc.* τοῦ μυστηρίου) as : "*that it should be preached ;*" or from supplying, with Grotius and Estius,[2] τῆς εὐδοκίας αὐτοῦ with οἰκον., in neither of which cases would there be left any explanation of the genitive sense applicable to τοῦ πληρώματος τ. κ. Quite erroneous, lastly, is the view of Storr, *Opusc.* I. p. 155, who is followed by Meier, that οἰκονομία τοῦ πληρ. τ. κ. is *administratio eorum quae restant temporum*, "the administration of those times that remain." For to take τ. πλήρ. τ. κ. in the sense of *reliqua tempora, i.e., novi foederis*, "the remaining times, *i.e.*, of the new covenant," is in the light of Gal. iv. 4, Mark i. 15, decidedly to misapprehend it. [See Note IX., p. 352 seq.] — ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ] *epexegetical infinitive*, which gives information as to the actual contents of that οἰκονομία : (*namely*) *again to gather up together*, etc. Therein the arrangement designated by οἰκονομία τ. πλ. τ. κ. was to consist. This connection is that which naturally suggests itself, and is more in keeping with the simple mode followed in the context of annexing the new portions of the discourse to what immediately precedes, than the connection with προέθετο,[3] or with τὸ μυστήρ. τοῦ θελ. αὐτοῦ.[4] We may add that Beza, Piscator, and others have taken εἰς οἰκον. τ. πλ. τ. κ. along with ἀνακεφαλ. as one idea ; but in that case the preceding ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ must appear quite superfluous and aimless, and εἰς οἰκονομ. κ.τ.λ., by being prefixed to ἀνακεφαλ., irrelevantly receives the main emphasis, which is not to be removed from ἀνακεφαλ. — ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι] κεφάλαιον in the verb κεφαλαιόω means, as it does also in classical usage, *chief thing, main point ;*[5] hence κεφαλαιόω : *summatim colligere*, as in Thuc. iii. 67. 5, vi. 91. 6, viii. 53. 1 ; Quinctil. i. 6. Comp. συγκεφαλαιοῦσθαι, Xen. *Cyr.* viii. 1. 15 ; Polyb. iii. 3. 1, 7, iv. 1. 9. Consequently ἀνακεφαλαιόω : *summatim recolligere*, "recapitulate summarily," which is said in Rom. xiii. 9 of that which has been previously expressed *singulatim*, "individually," in separate parts, but now is again gathered up in one main point, so that at Rom. *l.c.* ἐν τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ denotes that main point in which the gathering up is contained. And here this main point of gathering up again, unifying all the parts, lies *in Christ;* hence the gathering up is not *verbal*, as in Rom. *l.c.*, but *real*, as is distinctly apparent from the objects gathered up together, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς κ.τ.λ. It is to be observed withal, (1) that ἀνακεφαλ. does not *designate* Christ as κεφαλή — although He *really is* so (ver. 22) — so that it would be tantamount to ὑπὸ μίαν κεφαλὴν ἄγειν,

---

[1] Wolf, Olshausen, and others.

[2] Comp. Morus.

[3] Zachariae, Flatt, and others.

[4] Beza : Paul is explaining *quid mysterii nomine significare voluerit*, "what he wanted to indicate by the name 'mystery;' also Harless, comp. Olshausen, Schmid, *bibl. Theol.* II. p. 347, and others.

[5] See Wetstein, *ad Rom.* xiii. 9.

"to bring under one head,"[1] but as κεφάλαιον, which is evident from the etymology; (2) that we are not to bring in, with Grotius and Hammond, the conception of scattered warriors, or, with Camerarius, that of an arithmetical sum (κεφάλαιον, see Wetstein, *l.c.*), which must have been suggested by the context; (3) that the force of the *middle* is the less to be overlooked, inasmuch as an act of government on God's part is denoted: *sibi summatim recolligere*, "to gather again summarily for himself"; (4) that we may not give up the meaning of ἀνα, *iterum*, "again,"[2] which points back to a state in which no separation as yet existed.[3] This ἀνα has had its just force already recognized by the Peshito and Vulgate (*instaurare*, "to restore"), as well as by Tertull. *de Monog.* 5 (*ad initium reciprocare*, "to go back to the beginning"),[4] although κεφαλαιόω is overlooked by the former, and wrongly apprehended by the latter. See the more detailed discussion below. — τὰ πάντα] is referred by many (see below) merely to *intelligent* beings, or to *men*, which, according to a well-known use of the neuter, would be in itself admissible (Gal. iii. 22), but would need to be suggested by the context. It is quite general: *all created things and beings.* Comp. vv. 22, 23. — τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς] *that which is on the heavens and that which is on the earth.* ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐραν. (see the critical remarks) is so conceived of that the heavens are the stations at *which* the things concerned are to be found.[5] Even in the classical writers, we may add, prepositions occurring in close succession often vary their construction without any special design in it.[6] *As regards the real sense*, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐραν. is not to be arbitrarily limited either to *the spirits in heaven generally*,[7] or to the *angels*,[8] or to the *blessed spirits of the pious men of the O. T.*,[9] nor must we understand by it *the Jews*, and by τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς *the Gentiles*,[10] as, indeed, Koppe was able to bring out of it *all mankind* by declaring heaven and earth to be a periphrasis for κόσμος; but, entirely without restriction, *all things and beings existent in the heavens and upon earth* are meant, so that the preceding τὰ πάντα is specialized in its two main divisions. Irenaeus[11] quite arbitrarily thought of all *events* which should have come to pass on earth or in heaven, and which God gathers up, *i.e.*, brings to their complete fulfilment, in Christ as in their goal.[12] But *how far* has God gathered together again all things, things heavenly and things earthly, in Christ? Before the entrance of sin all created beings and things were undividedly united under God's government; all things in the world were normally combined into organic unity for God's ends and in His service. But through sin this original union and harmony was broken, first of all in heaven, where a part of the angels sinned and fell away from God;[1] these formed, under Satan, the kingdom antagonistic to God, and upon earth brought about the fall of man (2 Cor. xi. 3), extended their sway farther and farther, and were even worshipped in the heathen idols (1 Cor. x. 20 f.). With the fall of man there came to an end also the normal state of the non-intelligent κτίσις, "creature" (Rom. viii. 19 ff.); heaven and earth, which had become the scene of sin and of the demoniac kingdom (ii. 2, vi. 12), were destined by God to destruction, in order that one day a new heaven and a new earth—in which not sin any more, but moral righteousness shall dwell, and God shall be the all-determining power in all (1 Cor. xv. 28)—shall come imperishable (Rom. viii. 21) in its place (2 Pet. iii. 13). *The redeeming work of Jesus Christ* (comp. Col. i. 20) was designed to annul again this divided state in the universe, which had arisen through sin in heaven and upon earth, and to re-establish the unity of the kingdom of God in heaven and on earth; so that this gathering together again should rest *on*, and have its foundations *in*, *Christ* as the central point of union and support, without which it could not emerge. Before the Parousia, it is true, this ἀνακεφαλαίωσις is still but in course of development; for the devil is still with his demons ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (vi. 12), is still fighting against the kingdom of God and holding sway over many; many men reject Christ, and the κτίσις, "creature," *longs* after the renewal. But with the Parousia there sets in the full realization, which is the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, "restitution of all things" (Matt. xix. 28; Acts iii. 21; 2 Pet. iii. 10 ff.); when all antichristian natures and powers shall be rejected from heaven and earth, so that thereafter nothing in heaven or upon earth shall be excluded from this gathering together again.[2] Finally, the *middle voice* (*sibi* recolligere, "to gather for *himself*") has its warrant in the fact that God is the *Sovereign* (the head of Christ, 1 Cor. xi. 4 and iii. 23), who fulfils His will and aim by the gathering up again, etc.; so that, when the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις is completed by the victory over all antichristian powers, He resumes even the dominion committed to the Son, and then God is the sole ruling principle (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28). Our passage is accordingly so framed as to receive its historically adequate elucidation from the N. T., and especially from Paul himself; and there is no reason for seeking to explain it from a later system of ideas, as Baur does,[3] who traces it to the underlying Gnostic idea, that all spiritual life which has issued from the supreme God must return to its original unity, and in that view the "affected" expression εἰς οἰκον. τ. πληρ. τ. καιρ is held to convey a covert allusion to the Gnostic pleroma of aeons and its economy.[1] The "genuinely *Catholic* consciousness"[2] of the Epistle is just the genuinely *apostolic* one, necessarily rooted in Christ's own word and work. The person of Christ is not presented "under the point of view of the metaphysical necessity of the process of the self-realizing idea,"[3] but under that of its actual history, as this was accomplished, in accordance with the counsel of the Father, by the free obedience of the Lord.

---

[1] Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Piscator, Calovius, Bengel, Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, Matthies, Meier, de Wette, and others.

[2] Winer, *de verbor. cum praep. conj. in N. T. usu*, III. p. 3 f.

[3] In opposition to Chrysostom, Castalio, and many others.

[4] Comp. Goth.: "*aftra usfulljan*" (*again to fill up*).

[5] Comp. the well-known ἐπὶ χθονί (Hom. *Il.* iii. 195, *al.*); ἐπὶ πύλησιν (*Il.* iii. 149); ἐπὶ πύργῳ (*Il.* vi. 431).

[6] See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 1. 20. Comp. as to the local ἐπί with genitive and dative, *e.g.*, Hom. *Il.* i. 486.

[7] Rückert, Meier.

[8] Chrysostom, Calvin, Cameron, Balduin, Grotius, Estius, Calovius, Bengel, Michaelis, Zachariae, Rosenmüller, Baumgarten-Crusius [Weiss], and others.

[9] Beza, Piscator, Boyd, Wolf, Moldenhauer, Flatt, and others.

[10] Locke, Schoettgen, Baumgarten, Teller, Ernesti.

[11] *Adv. Haer.* iii. 18.

[12] Comp. Chrys.: τὰ γὰρ διὰ μακροῦ χρόνου οἰκονομούμενα ἀνηκεφαλαιώσατο ἐν Χριστῷ, τουτέστι συνέτεμε, "for the things long administered he gathered together in Christ, *i.e.*, cut them short."

---

[1] For this falling away is the necessary presupposition for the Satanic seduction of our first parents, 1 John iii. 8-10; John viii. 44, where an *originally* evil nature of the devil (Frommann, Hilgenfeld) is not to be thought of; see Hahn. *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 319 ff. On Jude 6 and 1 Tim. iii. 6, in which passages a reference has been wrongly found to the first fall in the angelic world, see Huther.

[2] Comp. Photius in Oecumenius.

[3] p. 424.

Remark 1.—The illustration which Chrysostom has given for τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς κ. τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, from the conception of a house repaired (ὡς ἂν περὶ οἰκίας τις εἴποι τὰ μὲν σαθρὰ τὰ δὲ ἰσχυρὰ ἐχούσης· ἀνῳκοδόμησε τὴν οἰκίαν . . . οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα πάντας ὑπὸ μίαν ἤγαγε κεφαλήν, "as one would say of a house having some things decayed and others strong: 'He so rebuilt the house, and there brought all under one head'"), has been again employed by Harless, whose view of the passage (approved by Schenkel) is that the apostle speaks thus, "*because the Lord and Creator of the whole body, of which heaven and earth are members, has in the restoration of the one member restored the whole body; and in this consists the greatest significance of the reconciliation, that it is not merely a restoration of the life of earth, but a bringing back of the harmony of the universe.*" But in this way the words of the apostle are made withal to suggest merely the *doing away of the contrast* between heaven and earth (or, according to Schenkel's tortuous metaphor, "between the heavenly glorified centre of creation and the earthly, sin-troubled circumference of creation"), and there is conceded to the τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς merely an indirect participation in the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, and the direct *de facto* operation of the Messianic οἰκονομία on the heavenly world is set aside—which appears the less admissible, inasmuch as τὰ ἐπὶ τ. οὐρ. *has the precedence.* According to Paul, the heavenly world *and* the earthly world were to be affected, the former as immediately and properly as the latter, by the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις τῶν πάντων; for the Satanic kingdom, for the destruction of which Christ came, and whose destruction was the condition of the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, has its seat in the regions of heaven (vi. 12; comp. Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 343 ff.), and works in the υἱοῖ τῆς ἀπειθείας (ii. 2) upon earth, so that in heaven *and* upon earth there exists no unity under God.

Remark 2.—The doctrine of *Restoration*, according to which those who have continued unbelieving and the demons shall still ultimately attain to salvation, altogether opposed as it is to the N. T., finds no support in our passage, where (in opposition to Origen, Samuel Crell, and others), on the contrary, in the ἀνακεφαλ. κ.τ.λ. there is obviously implied, from the general point of view occupied by Christian faith, the *separation* of unbelievers and of the demoniac powers, and their banishment into Gehenna; so that the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις is not meant *of every single individual*, but of the whole aggregate of heavenly and earthly things, which, after the antichristian individuals have been separated and consigned to hell, shall again in the renewed world be combined into unity under God, as once, before the entrance of sin, all things in heaven and on earth were combined into such unity. Hence Olshausen is wrongly of opinion that our passage (as well as Col. i. 20) is to be brought into harmony with the general type of Scripture doctrine by laying stress in the infinitive ἀποκεφαλ. upon *the design* of God "which, in the instituting of a redemption endowed with infinite efficacy, aims at the restoration of *universal harmony*, at the bringing back of *all that is lost*." Apart from the fact that ἀνακεφαλ. is only an *epexegetical* infinitive (see above), it is altogether opposed to Scripture to assume that the aim in redemption is the restoration of *all* that is lost, even of the *devils*. For those passages as to the universality of redemption, and sayings like 1 Pet. iv. 6, Phil. ii. 10 f., leave the constant teaching of the N. T. concerning everlasting perdition entirely untouched (comp. on Rom. v. 18, xi. 32; Phil. ii. 10); and as regards the *devils*, the design of God in the economy of redemption was to *vanquish* them (1 John iii. 8, and elsewhere; 1 Cor. xv. 24 f.), and to deliver them up to the penalties already prepared for them of everlasting pain in hell (Matt. xxv. 41; Jude 6; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Rev. xx. 1 f.; comp. Bertholdt, *Christol.* p. 223). The restoration of the devils, as an impossibility in the case of spirits radically opposed to God, is not in the whole N. T. so much as thought of. The prince of this world is only *judged*.

---

[1] See, on the other hand, Räbiger, *Christol. Paulina*, p. 55.

[2] Baur, *Christenth. d. drei erst. Jahrh.* p. 109.

[3] Baur, *neutest. Theol.* p. 264.

REMARK 3.—Those who understand τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρ. *specially of the angels* (see above) have been driven—inasmuch as these pure spirits have no need of redemption in the proper sense—to unbiblical expedients, such as the view of Calvin (comp. Boyd): that the angels before the redemption were not *extra periculum*, "beyond danger," but had through Christ attained "*primum ut perfecte et solide adhaereant Deo, deinde ut perpetuum statum retineant*," "that they should perfectly and firmly cleave to God, and then to retain a perpetual estate" (of all which the N. T. teaches nothing!); or that of Grotius: "*antea inter angelos factiones erant et studia pro populis* (Dan. x. 13!) . . . *ea sustulit Christus, rex factus etiam angelorum, unum ex tot populis sibi populum colligens*," "previously there were among the angels factions and devotion to the interests of public bodies (Dan. x. 13); these Christ removed, being made King of angels, collecting from so many peoples one for himself;" or that of Augustine and Zeger, that the *number* of the angels, which had been diminished by the fall of some, was *completed* again by the elect from among men. Baur (comp. Zanchius), out of keeping with the notion of the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, thought of the knowledge (iii. 10) and bliss (Luke xv. 10) of the angels as heightened by redemption. Others again (Chrysostom on Col. i. 20; Theophylact, Anselm, Cornelius à Lapide, Hunnius, Calovius, Bengel, *et al.*) have found the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις in the fact that the separation which sin had occasioned between the angels and sinful men was done away.[1] So also in substance Rückert: "Originally and according to the will of God the whole world of spirits was to be one, . . . through like love and obedience towards the one God. . . . Sin did away with this relation, mankind became separated from God; hence also of necessity the bond was broken, which linked them to the higher world of spirits. . . . Christ . . . is to unite mankind to Himself by a sacred bond, and thereby to bring them back to God, and by that very act also . . . to do away with the breach; all is again to become one." Comp. Meier, as also Bähr on Col. i. 20. But the apostle is in fact speaking of the reuniting not of the heavenly *with* the earthly, but of the heavenly *and* the earthly (comp. Remark 1); moreover, according to this explanation, the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις of the heavenly spirits with men would be the consequence of the expiation made for men by Christ, and thus Paul must logically have written: τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κ. τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. [See Note X., p. 353.]

---

[1] In connection with this view it was quite arbitrarily, and with a distinction at variance with Scripture, assumed that Christ was, as to His divine nature, the head of the angels, and as to His human nature, the head of men.

Ver. 11. Ἐν αὐτῷ] resumes with emphasis the ἐν Χριστῷ,[1] in order to attach thereto the following relative clause;[2] hence before ἐν αὐτῷ a comma is to be placed, and after it not a full stop, but only a comma.[3] Comp. on Col. i. 20. — ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐκληρώθημεν] *in whom* (is the causal basis, that) *we have also obtained the inheritance.* καί, in the sense of *also actually* introduces the accomplishment corresponding to the preparation (which was expressed by ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς οἰκονομίαν κ.τ.λ.).[4] It has reference to the *thing*, not to the *persons*, since otherwise it must have run καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκληρ., as in ver. 13; hence the translation of the Vulgate: "in quo *etiam nos*," etc., and others,[5] is incorrect. The *subject* is not the *Jewish Christians*,[6] because there is no antithesis of ἡμεῖς and ὑμεῖς, ver. 13, but the *Christians in general.* ἐκληρώθημεν means: *we were made partakers of the* κλῆρος, "inheritance" (Acts xxvi. 18; Col. i. 12), that is, *of the possession of the Messianic kingdom*, which before the Parousia is an ideal possession (ver. 14; Rom. viii. 24), and thereafter a real one. [See Note XI., p. 353.] The expression itself is to be explained in accordance with the ancient theocratic idea of the נַחֲלָה (Deut. iv. 20, ix. 26, 29), which has been transferred from its original Palestinian reference (Matt. v. 5) to the kingdom of the Messiah, and thus raised to its higher Christian meaning (see on Gal. iii. 18); and the *passive form* of this word, which is not met with elsewhere in the N. T., is quite like φθονοῦμαι, διακονοῦμαι, πιστεύομαι (see on Gal. iv. 20), since we find κληροῦν τινί used.[7] Others[8] have insisted on the signification of *being chosen by lot* (1 Sam. xiv. 41, 42; Herod. i. 94; Polyb. vi. 38. 2; Eurip. *Ion.* 416, *al.*), and have found as the reason for the use of the expression: "quia in ipsis electis nulla est causa, cur eligantur prae aliis," "because in the elect themselves there is no cause why they should be elected in preference to others,"[9] in which case, however, the conception of the accidental is held as excluded by the following προορισθ. κ.τ.λ.;[10] but it may be urged against this view that, according to Paul, it is God's gracious *will* alone that determines the ἐκλογή (ver. 5; Rom. ix. 16 ff.), not a θεῖα τύχη, "divine chance," which would be implied in the ἐκληρ.; comp. Plato, *Legg.* vi. p. 759 C: κληροῦν οὕτω τῇ θείᾳ τύχῃ ἀποδιδόντα, "thus to apportion one confiding in divine chance." — προορισθέντες κ.τ.λ.] *predestined*, namely, to the κλῆρος, *according to the purpose of Him, who worketh all things according to the counsel of His will.* The words are not be placed within a parenthesis, and τὰ πάντα is not to be limited to what pertains to the economy of salvation,[1] but God is designated as the *all-working* (of whom, consequently, the circumstances of the Messianic salvation can least of all be independent). Comp. πανεργέτης Ζεύς, "all effecting Zeus," Aesch, *Ag.* 1486. But, as God is the all-working, so is His decree the παντοκρατορικὸν βούλημα, "omnipotent purpose," Clem. *Cor.* I. 8. — As to the distinction between βουλή and θέλημα, comp. on Matt. i. 19. The former is the deliberate self-determination, the latter the activity of the will in general.

---

[1] Herm. *ad Viger.* pp. 734, 735; Bernhardy, p. 289 f.

[2] Kühner, II. § 630, 5.

[3] So, too, Lachmann, Tischendorf.

[4] See Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 132; Klotz, *ad Devar.* 636 f.; Baeumlein, *Partik.* 152.

[5] Including Erasmus, *Paraphr.*, and Rosenmüller.

[6] Grotius, Estius, Wetstein, Rosenmüller, Meier, Harless, Schenkel, and others.

[7] Pind. *Ol.* viii. 19; Thuc. vi. 42.

[8] Vulgate, Ambrosiaster, Chrysostom, Erasmus, Estius, de Wette, and Bleek [Cremer].

[9] Estius.

[10] See Chrysostom and Estius.

Ver. 12. *Causa finalis*, "the final cause," of the predestination to the Messianic κλῆρος :[2] *in order that we might redound to the praise of His glory* (actually, by our Messianic κληρονομία), *we who have beforehand placed our hope on Christ*,—we Jewish-Christians, to whom Christ even before His appearing was the object of their hope. Only now, namely, from εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς onward, does Paul divide the subject of ἐκληρώθ. and προορισθέντες, which embraced the Christians generally, into its two constituent parts, the *Jewish-Christians*, whom he characterizes by ἡμᾶς . . . τοὺς προηλπικότας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, and the *Gentile-Christians*, whose destination to the same final aim—namely, εἰς τὸ εἶναι εἰς ἔπαινον κ.τ.λ.—he dwells on afterward in vv. 13, 14 (passing over to them by ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς), and hence ver. 14 concludes with a repetition of εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.[3] — ἡμᾶς] has emphasis, preparing the way for the subsequent introduction of καὶ ὑυεῖς. — τοὺς προηλπικότας] *quippe qui*, "as they who," etc. On προελπίζειν, *to hope before*, comp. Poseidippus in Athen. ix. p. 377 C. The προ does not transfer the hoping into the *praescientia Dei*, "foreknowledge of God,"[4] nor has it a reference to the *later hoping of the Gentiles*,[5] since the *hoping* of the Gentiles is not subsequently expressed ; nor is προηλπ. *equivalent to the simple form*,[6] which is not the case of any verb with προ ; but it applies to the fact that the Jews had the *Old Testament prophecies*, and hence already *before Christ* set their hope upon the Messiah (Rom. iii. 2, ix. 4 ; Acts iii. 25, xxvi. 6 f., 22, xxviii. 20, *al.*). So, correctly, Zöckler takes it.[7] But de Wette, who[8] denies the division — also unnoticed by Chrysostom and his successors— into Jewish and Gentile Christians (understanding ἡμᾶς, generally, of the *Christians*, and ὑμεῖς, ver. 13, of the *readers*), takes προ in προηλπ. as : *before the Parousia*. Comp. Theophylact : πρὶν ἢ ἐπιστῇ ὁ μέλλων αἰών, "before the coming age impend." But in this way the προ would be *without significance*, while, as taken by us, it is *characteristic*. It is incorrect, too, that ver. 13 affirms nothing peculiar of the Gentile-Christians. As *standing in contrast*

---

[1] Piscator, Grotius.

[2] Many others, including Flatt, Meier, Harless, have attached εἰς τὸ εἶναι to προορισθ. (*predestined, to be*, etc.) ; but this is not only not in keeping with the analogous εἰς ἔπαινον κ.τ.λ., vv. 6 and 14, but also inappropriate, because προορισθ. did not yet refer specially to the Jewish-Christians.

[3] Thus what Paul dwells on in vv. 11–14 may be summarized thus : "In Christ we have really become partakers of the Messianic salvation, to which we were predestined by God, in order that we Jewish-Christians, and also you Gentile-Christians, should redound to the praise of His glory."

[4] Jerome.

[5] Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Boyd, Estius, Bengel, Michaelis, and others.

[6] Morus, Bretschneider.

[7] *de vi ac notione vocab.* ἐλπίς, 1856, p. 32 f.

[8] Comp. Rückert, Holzhausen, Matthies, Bleek.

to the προηλπικότας εἶναι *of the Jewish-Christians*, what is said in ver. 13 serves precisely to characterize the Gentile-Christians. They, without having entertained that previous hope (ii. 12), have heard, believed, etc. — The usual construction, suggested of itself by the very sequence of the words, has been—after the example of Morus, Koppe, ed. 1, Flatt, and Matthies — departed from by Harless, followed by Olshausen, inasmuch as he regards εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης αὐτοῦ as an inserted clause [*incisum*] : "*we who were predestined*, etc., *to be those—to the praise of His glory—who already before hoped in Christ.*" In this way Paul would point to the reason, why the κλῆρος had first been assigned to the Jews. But (1) in that case ἐκληρώθ. and προορισθ. must already have applied specially to the *Jewish-Christians*, which no reader could guess, and Paul, in order to his writing intelligibly, must have *indicated*, by putting it in some such way as : ἐν ᾧ ἡμεῖς ἐκληρώθημεν, οἱ προορισθέντες . . . εἰς τὸ εἶναι . . . τοὺς προηλπικότας κ.τ.λ. As the passage actually *stands*, the reader could find the Jewish-Christians designated only at ver. 12, not previously. (2) εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης αὐτοῦ has, in accordance with the context (see ver. 14 ; comp. also ver. 6), by no means the character of an incidental insertion, but the stress of defining the ultimate aim, and that not in respect of a pre-Christian state, but of the Christian one. This, however, only becomes suitably felt, when we *read* εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης αὐτοῦ *together*. (3) The predestination of God (προορισθέντες) is in the connection related not to a *pre-Christian* state, such as, according to Harless, the εἶναι τοὺς προηλπικότας ἐν τ. Χριστῷ would be, but to the realization of the Messianic blessedness (ver. 5). Comp. Rom. viii. 29 ; 1 Cor. ii. 7 ; as also Acts iv. 28. Lastly, (4) the *objections* taken by Harless to the usual connection of the words are not tenable. For (*a*) the symmetry of the two corresponding sentences in form and thought *depends on the fact* that in the case of both sections, the Jewish and the Gentile Christians, the glorifying of God is brought into prominence as the final aim of their attaining to salvation, and hence ver. 14 also closes with εἰς ἔπαινον τ. δόξ. αὐτοῦ. (*b*) The repeated mention of the predestination on God's part to salvation is solemn, not redundant ; and the less so, inasmuch as the description of God as τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος is added. (*c*) The objection that we cannot tell why the apostle brings in that predestination only with regard to the προηλπικότες, while yet it manifestly applies also to the ἀκούσαντες, is based on the misunderstanding, according to which ἐκληρώθ. and προορισθ. are already restricted to the Jewish-Christians ; for the subject of these words is still the Christians without distinction, — Jewish and Gentile Christians, — so that the predestination *of both the former and the latter* is asserted. It is only at ver. 12 that the *division* of the subject begins, which is continued in

Ver. 13, so that ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς leads over to the second constituent element (*you Gentile-Christians*). — As regards the *construction*, it is regarded by Wolf, Bengel, Morus, and others,[1] including Rückert, Matthies, Holzhausen, de Wette, Bleek, Bisping, as *anacoluthic ;* the ἐν ᾧ of the second half of the verse is held to resume the first. Incorrectly, since in the resumption καὶ ὑμεῖς would have been *essential.* As Paul has written the passage (καὶ πιστεύσ.), there is added to what has previously been affirmed of the ὑμεῖς (ἀκούσαντες), a *new* affirmation ; hence ἐν ᾧ κ. πιστ. κ.τ.λ. is the *continuation*, not the *resumption* of the discourse. The verb after ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς is therefore to be *supplied ;* not, however, ἠλπίκατε,[1] since in fact the preceding προηλπικότας—which, besides, was only an appositional constituent element of the discourse—would yield προηλπίκατε, which is inapplicable to the Gentile Christians ; nor yet ἐκληρώθητε,[2] since ἐκληρώθημεν, ver. 11, already embraced the Jewish and Gentile Christians, and with εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ. *a new portion* of the development sets in. The right course is merely to supply mentally the *substantive verb*, in accordance with the current expression ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι, to belong to Christ as the element of life, in which one exists. Hence : *in whom also ye are.* Thus Paul paves the way for his transition to the Gentile-Christians, in order, after first specifying how it was that they had become such (vv. 13, 14), finally to assert of them also the εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ (ver. 14). — ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγ. τῆς ἀληθ.] *after ye have heard the word* (the preaching) *of the truth ;* for after this hearing there set in with them the ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι. The truth κατ' ἐξοχήν, "pre eminently," is the *contents* of the λόγος. But a contrast to the types and shadows of the O. T.,[3] or to heathen error,[4] is not implied in the context. Comp. Col. i. 5 ; 2 Tim. ii. 15. — τὸ εὐαγγ. τ. σωτηρ. ὑμ.] descriptive apposition to λόγος τῆς ἀληθ. The genitive here also denotes the *contents ;* that which is made known in the gospel is the Messianic salvation. Harless takes both genitives as genitives *appositionis*, "of apposition," inasmuch as the gospel *is* the truth and the σωτηρία. The gospel, however, *is* not the salvation, but an exertion of the power of God, which *leads to salvation* (Rom. i. 16 ; 1 Cor. i. 18) ; the analogous combinations, too, of τὸ εὐαγγ. with a *genit. abstract.*, "an abstract genitive," as τὸ εὐαγγ. τῆς χάριτος τ. Θεοῦ (Acts xx. 24), τῆς εἰρήνης (Eph. vi. 15), τῆς βασιλείας, are opposed to the assumption of a *genit. apposit.*, "genitive of apposition." Comp. on Mark i. 1. Finally, the context also, by ἀκούσαντες and πιστεύσαντες, points not to what the doctrine *is*, but to what it *proclaims*. Comp. Rom. x. 14. — ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες κ.τ.λ.] A further stage of the setting forth how they became what they were, in order to reach its goal εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, ver. 14. Precisely with regard to the Gentile-Christians, who had previously been aloof from all theocratic connection (no προηλπικότες ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ), the apostle feels himself impelled not to be content with the simple "in whom also ye are, after ye have heard the Gospel," but specially to bring into relief the sealing of the Holy Spirit. — ἐν ᾧ] is referred not merely by those who regard it as resumptive (see above), but also by many others with Luther,[5] to *Christ ;* but why should we pass over the *nearest* antecedent ? The καί finds its reference, agreeably to the context, in the accession of the faith to the hearing (Rom. x. 14 ; 1 Cor. xv. 1). Hence ἐν ᾧ is to be referred, with Castalio, Calvin, Beza, Erasmus Schmid, and others,[1] to τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, and to be joined, with Castalio, to πιστεύσαντες, not to ἐσφραγίσθ. (as *usually*), according to which πιστεύσ. would be superfluous,[2] and the periodic flow of the discourse would be injuriously affected. Hence : *in which ye, having become believers, were sealed through the Holy Spirit.* As to πιστεύειν ἐν (Mark i. 15), see on Gal. iii. 26. — πιστεύσαντες] is not to be taken, with Harless, as *contemporaneous* with ἐσφραγ. (see on vv. 5, 9) ; but it contains that which was *prior* to the σφραγίζεσθαι. The order of conversion was : *hearing, faith, baptism, reception of the Spirit.* See Acts ii. 37, viii. 12, 17, xix. 5, 6 ; Rom. vi. 3, 4 ; Tit. iii. 5 f. ; Gal. iii. 2, iv. 6. Certainly even the becoming a believer is not the work of human self-determination (see Acts xvi. 14 ; Phil. i. 29 ; Rom. xii. 3 relates to the measure of faith *of the baptized*) ; yet *this* divine operation is only preparatory, and the effusion of the Spirit, properly so called, ensued only after baptism :[3] hence *water* and *Spirit* (John iii. 5). — ἐσφραγίσθητε] *were sealed, i.e., confirmed*, namely, as κληρονόμοι of the Messianic kingdom. [See Note XII., p. 353.] See what follows. Comp. iv. 30, and see on 2 Cor. i. 22 ; John iii. 33. This sealing is the indubitable guarantee of the future Messianic salvation received *in one's own consciousness* (Rom. viii. 16) through the Holy Spirit, not the attestation *before others.*[4] An allusion has been arbitrarily found in ἐσφραγ. to *circumcision* (Rom. iv. 11), or to the στίγματα of heathen ceremonies (Grotius assumes both : "*non extra signati estis in cute, quomodo Judaei circumcisi et Graecorum idolorum punctis notati,*" "ye were not sealed outwardly in the skin," as the Jews were circumcised and the Greeks were stamped with the marks of their idols"), nay, even to the σφραγίς *Dianae*, with which those initiated into her mysteries were marked.[5] — τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελ.] Dativus *instrumentalis*, "instrumental dative," and τῆς ἐπαγγ. is genitivus *qualitatis*, "genitive of quality," denoting the promise as *characteristic* of the Holy Spirit, for He is, in fact, the Spirit *promised* in the O. T. (Acts ii. 16 ff. ; Joel iii. 1–5 ; Zech. xii. 10 ; Isa. xxxii. 15, xliv. 3 ; Ezek. xxxvi. 26 f., xxxix. 29. Comp. Luke xxiv. 49 ; Acts i. 4 ; Gal. iii. 14). Others :[6] the Spirit, *who confirms the promise* (of salvation). But how wholly imported, since in πνεῦμα itself there is implied nothing at all of the notion of confirmation ! No, the Old Testament *promise belonged to* the Spirit ; He is specifically the *Spirit of promise*, and by that very fact He became for the recipients the *sealing of Messianic blessedness.* — τῷ ἁγίῳ] is not added accidentally, nor yet because the *sanctificatio* of the Spirit would be the confirmatory element,[1] for in τῷ ἁγίῳ there is implied the *quality*, not the *effect* of the Spirit ; but Paul desires to bring out *very emphatically and solemnly* that, by which the σφραγίζεσθαι has been accomplished ; hence he says, with corresponding pathos : τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἁγίῳ. We may add that we are not to think, with Grotius, Estius, and others, of the *miraculous gifts* of the Spirit, since, in fact, the *ὑμεῖς generally* are the σφραγισθέντες, but rather of the outpouring of the Spirit, which *all* experienced after their baptism (Acts ii. 38 ; Gal. iii. 2 ff.). See also ver. 14. — According to Schwegler,[2] the πνεῦμα τῆς ἐπαγγελ. is to be held as pointing to the later period, to which the doctrine of the Paraclete in the (not genuine) Gospel of John belongs. But Comp. Gal. iii. 14.

---

[1] Comp. already Jerome.

---

[1] Erasmus in his version, Beza, Castalio, Calvin, Estius, and others.

[2] Erasmus, *Paraphr. ;* Piscator, Zanchius, Cornelius à Lapide, Boyd, Vorstius, Zachariae, Koppe, and others, including Meier, Harless, Olshausen.

[3] Chrysostom.

[4] Cornelius à Lapide, Baumgarten ; Grotius thinks of both.

[5] Including Harless, Meier, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel.

---

[1] Comp. Erasmus, *Paraphr.*

[2] If ἐν ᾧ belongs to ἐσφραγ., we must, in the event of ᾧ applying to the Gospel, explain : "by means of which ye also, after ye became believers (or ye, after ye also became believers), were sealed." Comp. Beza. But if ᾧ is to apply to Christ, the sense would be : "in whom (being) ye also, after ye became believers (or : ye, after ye also became believers), were sealed." How utterly superfluous πιστεύσαντες is in either case, will be at once felt. Harless regards ἐν ᾧ as *more precisely defined* by τῷ πνεύματι, inasmuch as the Spirit of God is also the Spirit of Christ (Rom. viii. 9 ; 2 Cor. iii. 17 : Gal. iv. 6). But even thus πιστεύσαντες remains unnecessary, since ἐν ᾧ surely expresses the already existing spiritual union with Christ.

[3] As to the single instance of the effusion of the Spirit *before* baptism, see on Acts x. 44.

[4] ὥστε εἶναι δῆλον, ὅτι Θεοῦ ἔστε λάχος κ. κλῆρος, "so that it may be evident that ye are God's lot and inheritance," Theophylact ; comp. Chrysostom, Cornelius à Lapide, Flatt, Holzhausen, and others.

[5] Amelius ; comp. note on Gal. vi. 17.

[6] Calvin, Beza, Castalio, Piscator ; and as early as Chrysostom and Theophylact, alongside of the former correct view.

Ver. 14. Ὅς ἐστιν ἀῤῥαβὼν τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμ.] stands in significant relation (as affording more precise information) to ἐσφραγίσθητε : *who is earnest of our inheritance ;* for in the reception of the Spirit the recipients have obtained the *guarantee*—as one receives earnest-money as a guarantee of future payment in full—that they shall become actually partakers of the Messianic blessedness (comp. Rom. viii. 15–17 ; Gal. iv. 6, 7). ὅς, applying to the πνεῦμα, not to *Christ*, agrees in gender with ἀῤῥαβών.[3] As to the *epexegetic* relative, see Nägelsb. on Hom. *Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 3. As to ἀῤῥαβών, see on 2 Cor. i. 22. — εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως] *unto the redemption*, etc., is likewise (comp. also iv. 30) the *causa finalis*, "final cause," of ἐσφραγίσθητε κ.τ.λ., consequently that, to which the *purpose* of God was directed, when ye were sealed. Comp. ver. 10. Others connect it with ὅς ἐστιν . . . ἡμῶν,[4] in which case εἰς is taken by some likewise in a telic sense, by others as *usque ad* (the latter at variance with the parallel εἰς which follows). But the more precise definition thus resulting would in fact be, after τ. κληρον. ἡμ., quite self-evident and unnecessary. — The ἀπολύτρωσις is here—in accordance with the whole connection, and because the περιποίησις (see below) is the subject which experiences the ἀπολύτρωσις—*the final consummation* of the redemption effected by the λύτρον of Christ (ver. 7) at the Parousia (Luke xxi. 28), when suffering, sin, and death are wholly done away, and in the glorifying (resurrection, or relative transformation) of the body there sets in the δόξα of the children of God, and the in all all-determining dominion of God (1 Cor. xv. 28). See Rom. viii. 18–23 ; 1 Cor. xv. 54 ff. Comp. Eph. iv. 30. Beza aptly terms this final definitive redemption ἀπολύτρωσιν ἐλευθερώσεως. — The περιποίησις αὐτοῦ (for αὐτοῦ at the end does not apply, as it is usually referred, merely to τῆς δόξης, but also to τῆς περιποιήσ., whereby the latter obtains its definite character, and the discourse gains in vividness and energy[5]) is the *acquisition of God*, i.e., *the people ac-*

---

[1] Pelagius, Lombard.

[2] In Zeller's *Jahrb.* 1844, p. 383.

[3] See Herm. *ad Viger.* p. 708 ; Heindorf, *ad Phaedr.* p. 279 ; Buttm. *neut. Gr.* p. 241 [E. T. 281].

[4] Estius, Flatt, Rückert, Schenkel, Bleek, *al.*

[5] So also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 29 ; and Schenkel.

quired by God for His possession, by which is here meant *the whole body of Christians*, the true people of God, acquired by God as His property by means of the redeeming work of Christ. Comp. 1 Pet. ii. 9 ; as also Acts xx. 28, where the Christian community is presented as the acquisition of *Christ* (comp. Tit. ii. 14). The expression quite corresponds to the Hebrew סְגֻלָּה יְהוָֹה, by which the people of Israel is designated as the sacred *peculium Dei*, "peculiar treasure of God," and opposed to the Gentiles. See Ex. xix. 5 ; Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18 f. ; Ps. cxxxv. 4. The LXX. too, though usually expressing the notion of סגלה by *περιούσιος*, translate it, Mal. iii. 17, by *περιποίησις*. Comp. also Isa. xliii. 21 : *λαόν μου ὃν περιεποιησάμην* (יָצַרְתִּי) *κ.τ.λ.* The objection to this view,[1] that *περιποίησις* never in itself, without defining addition, signifies the people of God,[2] entirely disappears when we take in the *αὐτοῦ* : "*unto redemption of His acquired possession, unto the praise of His glory.*" Others, retaining likewise the signification of *acquired possession*, explained it in the *neuter* sense, like Calovius (comp. already Bugenhagen) : "plena fruitio redemtionis *haereditatis nobis acquisitae*," "the full fruition of the redemption of the inheritance acquired for us." Comp. Matthies : "unto the redeeming of the promised glorious possession." But how can it be said of the salvation acquired for us, that it is redeemed ? And the *plena fruitio*, "full fruition," is imported. Beza, wrongly denying the concrete use of *περιποίησις*, insists upon the *abstract* notion of *vindication*, *assertion*, and specifies as the meaning : "*dum in liberationem vindicemur*," "until we are emancipated." But this would need to be expressed by *εἰς περιποίησιν τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως* (comp. 1 Thess. v. 9 ; 2 Thess. ii. 14). The word is also taken in the *abstract* sense by those who understand it as *preservation*, *conservatio*,[3] like Bengel, Bos ("redemtio, quae salutem et conservationem affert," "redemption which effects salvation and preservation"), Bretschneider ("redemtio, qua vitae aeternae servamur," "redemption whereby we are preserved unto eternal life"), Holzhausen (who, following Homberg, arbitrarily assumes *ἀπολ. τῆς περιπ.* to stand for *ἀπολ. καὶ περιπ.*). But against these explanations it may be decisively urged that in the case of *περιποίησις* the thought : *unto everlasting life*, or the like, is added arbitrarily, and that the assumed genitive relation does not arise out of the notion of *ἀπολύτρωσις*, according to which the genitive is either the *subject*, *which* is redeemed (Luke xxi. 28 ; Rom. viii. 23), or expresses that, *from which* one becomes free (Heb. ix. 15 ; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 178). To the erroneous attempts at explanation belongs also that[4] which takes *τῆς περιποιήσεως* for *τὴν περιποιηθεῖσαν*, *the redemption acquired for us*, or (so Bleek) the redemption, *which is to become our possession.*[5] — *εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*] a climactic parallel to what goes before, containing as it does the *final* aim of God in the sealing with the

---

[1] Which is followed, after the Peshito and Oecumenius, by Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, and most expositors, including Flatt, Rückert, Meier, Harless, Olshausen, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel.

[2] See especially Koppe.

[3] Heb. x. 39 ; 2 Chron. xiv. 13 ; *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 633 ; Plat. *Defin.* p. 415 C ; Wetst. II. p. 424.

[4] Vatablus, Koppe.

[5] This sense, too, would in fact have needed to be expressed by εἰς περιποίησιν τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως.

Holy Spirit. And thus has Paul accordingly reached what he had in view in the joining on of ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς, ver. 13, namely, the assigning to the Gentile-Christians the same ultimate destination, which he has in ver. 12 predicated of the Jewish-Christians. — The reference of αὐτοῦ to *God*, as in vv. 12, 6,[1] flows from ἐσφραγ., which is *God's* act.[2] The glory of *God* is the final aim of the whole unfolding of salvation.

Ver. 15.[3] Only now, after the general ascription of praise to God for the Christian economy of salvation, which had since ver. 3 flowed forth from him in an enraptured greeting, does Paul reach that, with which he is wont on other occasions at once to begin—the thanksgiving to God for the *Christian position of the readers*, and *intercession* for them. — διὰ τοῦτο] has reference to vv. 13, 14 : *because this is the case, that ye too are in Christ and have been sealed with the Holy Spirit*, etc. See already Theophylact. There is no reason for going farther back and referring it to the whole preceding development from ver. 3 onward,[4] since thanksgiving and intercession have reference to the *readers*, and it is only ver. 13 that has led over to the latter. — κἀγώ] *I also ;* for Paul knows that by his exercise of prayer, ver. 16, he is *co-operating* with the readers. Comp. on Col. i. 9. — ἀκούσας] does not serve to prove that the Epistle could not have been written to the Ephesians, or not to them alone (see Introd. § 1) ; Grotius in fact has already aptly remarked : "Loquitur autem apostolus de profectu evangelii apud Ephesios, *ex quo ipse ab illis discesserat*," "the apostle speaks, moreover, of the progress of the Gospel among the Ephesians from the time when he had departed from them."[5] No doubt Olshausen[6] maintains that Paul so expresses himself as to make it apparent that with a great proportion of his readers he was not personally acquainted, appealing to Col. i. 4. But may he not here, as at Philem. 5, have heard respecting those who were *known* to him, what at Col. i. 4 he has heard respecting those who were previously *unknown* to him ? — τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν] *fidem*, *quae ad vos pertinet*, i.e., *vestram fidem*, "the faith which pertains to you, *i.e.*, your faith." Comp. Acts xvii. 28, xviii. 15, xxvi. 3.[7] The difference between ἡ καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστις and ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν lies only in the form of conception, not in the thing itself. Yet the mode of expression, not occurring elsewhere in the letters of the apostle, belongs to the peculiar phenomena of our Epistle. The assertion of Harless, that it denotes the faith of the readers objectively, as in itself a thing to be found among them, while ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν denotes it subjectively, according to its individual character in each one,[8] is the less capable of proof, in proportion to the *prevalent use* among the later Greeks of the periphrasis of the genitival relation by κατά.[9] — ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ] belonging to πίστιν (fidem vestram in Christo repositam, "your faith reposed in Christ"), and blended without any connecting article into unity of idea with it. See on Gal. iii. 26. Winzer connects it with ὑμᾶς: "fidem, quae vobis, Domino Jesu veluti insitis, . . . inest," "faith which is in you, as though you were in the Lord Jesus;" but this is forbidden by the order of the words. — καὶ τὴν ἀγάπ. τὴν εἰς πάντας κ.τ.λ.] Here, too, Paul *might* have left out the second article, so that the sense would be: καὶ τὸ ἀγάπην ὑμᾶς ἔχειν εἰς πάντας (comp. Col. i. 4), as at 2 Cor. vii. 7: τὸν ὑμῶν ζῆλον ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. But he has first thought of the notion of love *in itself*, and then *added thereto*, as a special important element, the thought, τὴν εἰς πάντας τ. ἀγ. — πάντας "character Christianismi," "the stamp of Christianity," Bengel. Comp. vi. 18; Philem. 5. We may add Chrysostom's apt remark: πανταχοῦ συνάπτει καὶ συγκολλᾷ τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην θαυμαστήν τινα ξυνωρίδα, "He everywhere joins and cements faith and love—a wonderful pair." Comp. Gal. v. 6; 1 Cor. xiii.

---

[1] Not, with Estius and Hofmann, to Christ.

[2] See van Hengel, *Annot.* p. 198 ff.

[3] On vv. 15–19, see Winzer, *Commentat.*, Lips. 1836.

[4] Harless, Winzer, Schenkel, and others, following Oecumenius.

[5] Comp. Winzer, p. 5; Wiggers in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1841, p. 430 f. ; Wieseler, p. 445 ; and already Theodoret *in loc.*

[6] Comp Bleek.

[7] Thuc. vi. 16. 5 (τῷ κατ᾽ αὐτοὺς βίῳ) ; Ael. *V. H.* ii. 12 (ἡ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν ἀρετή).

[8] Comp. Matthies and Schenkel.

[9] See Valckenaer, *ad Luc.* p. 4 f.; Schaefer, *ad Long.* p. 330 ; Wesseling, *ad Diod. Sic.* xiv. 12.

Ver. 16. Οὐ παύομαι] a popular form of hyperbole. My thanksgiving—so full and urgent is it—can find no end. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 2; Luke ii. 37; Herod. vii. 107: τοῦτον δὲ αἰνέων οὐκ ἐπαύετο, "He did not cease praising this one." — εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν] *to give thanks on your account.* On the *participle*, see Herm. *ad Viger.* p. 771; Bernhardy, p. 477; and on ὑπέρ (*super* vobis, "*over* you"), comp. v. 20; Rom. i. 8, Elz.; 1 Tim. ii. 1. — μνείαν ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχ. μου] accompanying definition to εὐχαριστῶν: *while I make mention in my prayers.* Comp. Rom. i. 9; 1 Thess. i. 2; Phil. i. 3; Philem. 4. *What* Paul makes mention of is learned from the context, which furnishes not merely ὑμῶν (Elz.; see the critical remarks), but a more precise definition, namely: *of what he* has heard *concerning the faith and love of the readers*, and for which he gives thanks on their account. This μνείαν ποιούμενος κ.τ.λ., however, is not superfluous, and after εὐχαρ. ὑπὲρ ὑμ. self-evident; but it serves, through the close joining on to it of the following ἵνα κ.τ.λ. (after ver. 16 only a comma is to be placed), as a means of leading over from the *thanksgiving* to the *intercession* connected with it, and is thereby *accounted for.* — ἐπί] of the prevailing relations and circumstances, in or under which anything takes place. See on Rom. i. 10.

Ver. 17. Ἵνα ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.] contains the *design* cherished by Paul in the μνείαν . . . προσευχ. μου: *in order that God might give you*, etc. In this expressed *design* is implied the *intercessory tenor* of the μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι; hence ἵνα is not here to be deprived of its notion of *design*, nor is it to be explained[1] by supplying before it the conception of "*praying.*" The apostle would say that *what he has heard of their faith*, etc., *induces him to unceasing thanksgiving on their behalf, while he makes mention of it in his prayers to the end that God might give them*, etc. The telic ὅπως, Philem. 6, stands in another connection than the ἵνα in our passage. See on Philem. *l.c.* The *optative* δῴη[2] is used, because the design is thought of as *subjective conception and expectation*, the realization of which is dependent entirely upon the will of God, and consequently belongs only to the category of what is wished and possible. On ἵνα with an optative[1] after the present or future, see, generally, Hermann, *ad Soph. El.* 57 ; *ad Aj.* 1217 ; Reisig, *ad Oed. Ch.* p. 168 ff. ; Bernhardy, p. 407 ; and especially Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 622 ff. — ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμ. Ἰ. Χ.] for God has sent Christ—who, having before all time proceeded from His essential nature (Col. i. 15), was the creative organ of the Father—forth in the fulness of the time in pursuance of His decree, to which the Son was obedient (Phil. ii. 8), has given Him up to death, raised and exalted Him, and is continually the Head of Christ (1 Cor. xi. 3), who even as σύνθρονος, "co-enthroned," of the Father is subordinate to the Father (Rom. viii. 34), [See Note V., p. 38, by Am. Ed., on Galatians], and finally will give back to God the dominion which God has given to Him (1 Cor. xv. 27, 28). In the consciousness of His relation of dependence on God, Christ Himself calls the Father Θεός μου, John xx. 17 ; Matt. xxvii. 46. Comp. Col. ii. 2, Lachm. The opinion extorted in the anti-Arian interest from the Fathers,[2] that ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ κυρ. applies to Christ's human nature, and ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης to the divine,[3] is to be mentioned only as matter of history, as are also the forced construction, to which Menochius and Vatablus were induced by a like prejudice to resort, that Θεὸς and τῆςδόξης are to be taken together (τοῦ κυρίου . . . πατήρ being inserted), and the at least more skilful turn of Estius : "Deus, qui est Domini nostri Jesu Christi pater gloriosus," "God, who is the glorious father of our Lord Jesus Christ." — ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης] *the Father* (namely, of Christians) *to whom the glory* (the majesty κατ' ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminently") *belongs.* See on Acts vii. 2, and 1 Cor. ii. 8. The resolution into an adjective *pater gloriosus,* "glorious father,"[4] is in itself arbitrary, does not exhaust the eminent sense of ἡ δόξα, and fails to perceive the oratorical force[5] of the substantival designation. Others take πατήρ in the derived sense of *auctor,* "author,"[6] so that God is designated as He, from whom the glory of the Christians[7] proceeds. Certainly the idea of *auctor,* "author," may be expressed, specially in the more elevated style, by πατήρ ;[8] but as this is nowhere else done by Paul, so here he has no reason for resorting to such an usage, to which besides the analogous expressions, Θεὸς τῆς δόξης, "God of glory" (Ps. xxix. 3 ; Acts vii. 2), βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης, "King of glory" (Ps. xxiv. 7), κύριος τῆς δόξης, "Lord of glory" (1 Cor. ii. 8), Χερουβὶμ δόξης, "cherubim of glory" (Heb. ix. 5), are opposed. We may add, that the description of God by ὁ Θεὸς

---

[1] Harless; comp. Rückert, Olshausen, Winer, § 41, and others.

[2] On this form of later Greek instead of δοίη, see Buttmann, I. p. 507; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 346.

---

[1] Lachmann and Rückert (as also Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* III. p. 230) write δώῃ with an *iota subscriptum* under η, so that it would thus be the Ionic *subjunctive* (*Od.* xii. 216). But often as the aorist subjunctive of δίδωμι occurs in the N.T., this *Homeric* form *never* presents itself. The form δῷ in B is a manifest emendation.

[2] See Suicer, *Thes.* I. p. 944.

[3] δόξαν γὰρ τὴν θείαν φύσιν ὠνόμασεν, "for he called the divine nature, glory!" Theodoret and Oecumenius ; comp. even Bengel and Bisping.

[4] Beza, Calvin, Estius, Michaelis, and others.

[5] Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 887.

[6] Erasm. *Paraphr.;* Bucer, Cornelius à Lapide, Grotius, Wolf, and others, including Holzhausen and Olshausen.

[7] According to Grotius : of Christ and the Christians.

[8] Job xxxviii. 28 ; Jas. i. 17, where the φῶτα are personified ; Pind. *Pyth.* iv. 313, where Orpheus is called ἀοιδᾶν πατήρ ; and see Ast, *Lex. Plat.* III. p. 66 ; Jacobs, *ad Ach. Tat.* p. 392 f. ; John viii. 44 is not here applicable.

. . . *δόξης* stands in appropriate relation to the design of the intercession; for of the God of Christ and Father of glory it is to be expected that He will do that, which the cause of Christ demands, and which serves to the manifestation of His own glory. Oecumenius rightly remarks: *καὶ πρὸς τὸ προκείμενον ὀνομάζει τὸν Θεόν*. — *πνεῦμα σοφίας κ. ἀποκαλύψ.*] The *Holy Spirit*, too (for it is not the *human spirit* that is here meant, as Michaelis, Rückert, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek would take it[1]), Paul is wont to characterize *πρὸς τὸ προκείμενον*, Rom. viii. 2, 15; 2 Cor. iv. 13; Gal. vi. 1. Comp. 2 Tim. i. 7. Here: *the Spirit who works wisdom and gives revelation* (1 Cor ii. 10). The latter is a *greater* result of the work of the Spirit,[2] in accordance with which He not only by His enlightening operation furnishes wisdom (*γνῶσις θείων κ. ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων καὶ τῶν τούτων αἰτίων*, "the knowledge of things divine and human, and of their causes," 4 Macc. i. 16; conceived of, however, by Paul in reference to the *Christian economy of salvation*, comp. ver. 8), but further, as the organ of God, effects also special revelations of divine saving truths and purposes not otherwise known. Harless regards *κ. ἀποκαλ.* as the *objective medium*, which brought about the state of *σοφία*, so that the *character* of the *σοφία* is more precisely defined by *κ. ἀποκαλ.* But in passages like Rom. i. 5, *χάριν κ. ἀποστολήν*, xi. 29, *τὰ χαρίσματα κ. ἡ κλῆσις τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the discourse advances from the general to the special, not from the thing itself to its objective medium. Logically more natural, besides, would be the advance from the objective medium to the subjective state, according to which Paul would have written: *ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ σοφίας*. Finally, the *climactic* relation, which is brought out in the two words under our view, makes the wish of the apostle appear more fervid and full, and so more in keeping with his mood. It is obvious of itself, we may add, that Paul here desires for his readers, to whom in fact the Spirit has been already given from the time of their conversion (ver. 13), a *continued* bestowal of the same for their ever-*increasing* Christian enlightenment.[3] Baur, p. 437, conjectures here something of a Montanistic element. But it was not by the Montanists that the *πνεῦμα* was first regarded as the principle of Christian wisdom, etc.; it is so already in the teaching of the whole N. T. — *ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ*] That *αὐτοῦ* does not apply to *Christ*,[4] but to *God* (although we have not to write *αὑτοῦ*), is clear from the *αὐτοῦ* of vv. 18, 19; it is only at ver. 20 that the discourse passes over to Christ. Nor is *ἐν ἐπιγν. αὐτοῦ*, with Chrysostom, Theophylact, Zachariae, Koppe (with hesitation), Lachmann, Olshausen (who was forced to this by his explaining *πνεῦμα σοφ. κ. ἀποκαλ.* in the sense of extraordinary charismata), to be attached to *what follows*, whereby the parallelism (*πνεῦμα σοφ. κ. ἀποκ.* is parallel with *πεφωτ. τ. ὀφθ. τ. καρδ. ὑμ.*, and *ἐν ἐπιγν. αὐτ.* with *εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι κ.τ.λ.*) would without reason be destroyed;[1] but it denotes *the sphere of mental activity*, *in which* they, already at work therein (and that likewise through the Spirit, ver. 13), are to receive the spirit of wisdom and revelation.[2] Erroneously *ἐν* is taken for *εἰς*,[3] or as *per*,[4] which latter would represent the knowledge of God as *bringing about* the communication of the Spirit, and so invert the state of the case. It is true that Calovius remarks: "quo quis magis agnoscit Christum, eo sapientior fit et revelationem divini verbi magis intelligit," "The more one acknowledges Christ, the wiser he becomes, and understands the revelation of the divine word the better;" but the question is one, not of an *agnitio*, but of a *cognitio*, and not of *understanding* the revelation of the word, but of a revelation *to be received* through the agency of the Holy Spirit. — In *ἐπίγνωσις* observe the force of the *compound*, which implies an *exact and penetrating* *γνῶσις*, as is very evident especially from 1 Cor. xiii. 12, and is wrongly denied by Olshausen.[5] [See Note XIII., p. 353.]

---

[1] Rückert: "God grant you a heart wise and open for His revelations;" de Wette: "the quality of mind which consists in wisdom (mediate knowledge) and revelation (susceptibility for the immediate knowledge of divine truth"). According to Schenkel, it is the spirit wrought in the regenerate by the Holy Spirit. All this is opposed to the N. T. use of *πνεῦμα* with the *genitivus abstracti*, "abstract genitive." And nowhere in the N. T., where the *being given* is predicated of the *πνεῦμα*, is it anything else than the *objective πν.*, whether it be divine or demoniacal (Luke xi. 13; John iii. 34; Acts viii. 18, xv. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 8; 2 Tim. i. 7; 1 John iii. 24; Rom. v. 5, xi. 8). The presence or absence of the article with *πνεῦμα* makes no difference; see on Gal. v. 16. As to the singular expression *πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης*, used of the Spirit *of Christ*, in Rom. i. 4, see on that passage.

[2] But not, as Olshausen (comp. Grotius) maintains, the *χάρισμα* of prophecy, of which the more detailed exposition, ver. 18 ff., shows no trace. And Paul, in fact, is praying for *all* his readers. See, however, 1 Cor. xii. 29.

[3] Comp. Col. i. 9.

[4] Beza, Calvin, Calovius, Baumgarten, Flatt.

Ver. 18. *Πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς κ.τ.λ.*] is usually[6] taken as *appositional*, and made dependent on *δῴη ὑμῖν*; in which case it has been rightly observed that the translation should not be, with Luther: *enlightened eyes*, but, on account of the article: He *may* give to you *the eyes enlightened*, etc. But (1) in general an enlightened understanding is not proper to be set forth as in *apposition* to the Holy Spirit, but rather as the *effect* of the same. (2) The conception that God *gives* to them their eyes (which as such they already *have*) in the condition of enlightenment, as *πεφωτισμένους*, remains in any case an awkward one; inasmuch as we should have to transform the *giving*, which was still a proper and actual giving in ver. 17, zeugmatically into the notion of *making* at ver. 18,[7] in order to remove the incongruity caused by the presence of the article. Bengel, with his fine insight, aptly remarks: "Quodsi *ὀφθαλμούς* esset sine articulo, posset in sensu *abstracto* sumi (*enlightened eyes*) et cum *det* construi," "But if *ὀφθαλμούς* were without the article, it could be taken in an abstract sense (*enlightened eyes*) and be construed with *det*." Hence, with Beza, Bengel, Koppe, Bleek, *πεφωτισμ.* is to be taken as the so called accusative *absolute*, such as, from a mingling in the conception of two sorts of construction, is to be met with often also in classical writers —and that without repeating the subject (ὑμᾶς) in the accusative (in opposition to Buttmann)—instead of another case which would be required in strict accordance with the construction, particularly instead of the dative;[1] and thus Beza's proposal to read πεφωτισμένοις was entirely uncalled for.[2] Accordingly, πεφωτισμ. relates to ὑμῖν, and τοὺς ὀφθ. is the accusative of more precise definition: *enlightened in respect of the eyes of your heart*, i.e., *so that ye are then enlightened*, etc., with which is expressed the *result* of the communication of the Spirit prayed for.[3] — τοὺς ὀφθαλμ. τῆς καρδ. ὑμ.] figurative designation of the *understanding*,[4] which is *enlightened*, when man *discerns the divine truth*. The opposite: Rom. i. 21, xi. 8, 10. The reference of the enlightenment to *knowledge* is necessarily given by ὀφθαλμούς, and should not have been regarded as one-sided;[5] and the power of the new life is not here included under the πεφωτισμ., since it is not the heart in general, but the *eyes* of the heart that are set forth as enlightened, consequently the organ of *cognition*.[6] — καρδία] does not merely denote, according to the popular biblical usage, the faculty of emotion and desire,[7] but is the concrete expression for the central seat of the psychico-pneumatic personality, consequently embracing together all the agencies (thinking, willing, feeling) in the exercise of which man has the consciousness of his personal inward experience; in which case the context must suggest what side of the self-conscious inner activity of life (here, the *cognitive*) is in particular to be thought of.[8] —εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς] aim of πεφωτισμ. κ.τ.λ.: *in order that ye may know what* (quanta, "how great") *is the hope of His calling, i.e.*, what a great and glorious hope is given to the man, whom God has called to the kingdom of the Messiah, by means of that calling (τῆς κλήσ. is genitive of the efficient cause). ἐλπίς, accordingly, is not here, any more than elsewhere (Rom. viii. 24 ; Gal. v. 5 ; Col. i. 5, *al.*), *res sperata*, "object hoped for," as the majority, including Meier and Olshausen, take it. Observe also here the three main elements in the subjective state of Christians : *faith*, and *love*, and *hope* (vv. 15, 18); in presence of *faith* and *love* the enlightenment by the Holy Spirit is to make the glory of *hope* more and more known ; for the πολίτευμα of Christians is in heaven (Phil. iii. 20), whither their whole thoughts and efforts are directed. Faith, with the love which accompanies it, remains the *centre* of Christianity ; but hope withal encourages and animates by holding before them the constant *object of their aim.*[1] This in opposition to Weiss, who here finds hope brought into prominence, "quite after the Petrine manner," as the centre of Christianity.[2] — καὶ τίς ὁ πλοῦτος κ.τ.λ] this is now the *object* of the hope. The repetition of τίς, as well as the καὶ τίς . . . καὶ τί, has rhetorical emphasis (comp. Rom. xi. 34 f.); and, in ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ, what a copious and grand accumulation, mirroring, as it were, the weightiness of the thing itself ! which is not to be weakened by adjectival resolution of the genitives.[3] δόξα, *glory*, is the essential characteristic of the Messianic salvation to be received from God as an inheritance at the Parousia (Rom. viii. 17); and how great the rich *fulness* of this glory is, the readers are called to realize. ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις does not mean : *in the Holiest of all* (Heb. ix. 12), as Homberg and Calovius conjectured, for this is not suggested by the context ; but : *among the saints* (Num. xviii. 23 ; Job xlii. 15 ; Acts xx. 32, xxvi. 18); for the community of believers (*these* are the ἅγιοι, i. 1, 4), inasmuch as they are to be the subjects of the Messianic bliss, is the sphere, outside of which this πλοῦτος κ.τ.λ. will not be found. Comp. ὁ κλῆρος τῶν ἁγίων, Col. i. 12. It is connected with the ἐστί to be mentally supplied after τίς, so that we have to translate, as is required by the article before πλοῦτος : *what, i.e.*, how great and exceeding, is *the riches*, etc., among the saints. Harless objects that Paul must have written ὁ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, and that ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις receives unduly the main stress. But the construction τίς ἐστιν ὁ πλοῦτος ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις is in fact logically quite correct, and ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις would have of necessity the main emphasis only if it stood after τίς. Usually[4] ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις is regarded as an appendage to τῆς κληρονομ. αὐτοῦ : "the inheritance given by God among the saints," in connection with which Rückert, quite at variance with N. T. usage, explains οἱ ἅγιοι of the "collective body of morally good beings in the other world." But since ἡ κληρονομία Θεοῦ is completely and formally defined by this very Θεοῦ (αὐτοῦ), and does not first receive its completeness by means of ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις (see, on the contrary, Rom. viii. 17 ; Gal. iv. 7), this more precisely defining addition must have been attached by means of τῆς, and passages like Rom. ix. 3; 1 Tim. vi. 17; 1 Cor. x. 18; 2 Cor. vii. 7 (see Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 195 f.), are not analogous. If αὐτοῦ were *not* in the text, ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις might be the definition of the κληρονομία here meant, and blended with τῆς κληρονομίας so as to form one idea. We may add, that Harless wrongly refers to the riches of the glory, etc., preponderantly to the *present earthly βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.* Comp. de Wette. It is only the *future* kingdom of God, to be set up at the Parousia, that is the object of the κληρονομία (1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 50 ; Gal. v. 21 ; Eph. v. 5 ; Matt. xxv. 34); and here in particular the context (ἐλπίς, ver. 18 ; ἐγείρας κ.τ.λ., ver. 20) still points to the *future* glory, which Paul *realizes as already present.*

---

[1] See Harless.

[2] Comp. 2 Pet. i. 2.

[3] Luther, Castalio Piscator, Cornelius à Lapide, Wolf, Bengel, Moldenhauer, Rosenmüller, and others.

[4] Erasmus, Calovius, and others.

[5] Olshausen appeals to the fact that, just where the most exalted form of knowledge —the *charismatic*—is spoken of, the word employed is not *ἐπίγνωσις*, but *γνῶσις*, 1 Cor. xii. 8, xiii. 8. *Γνῶσις*, however, in the charismatic sense was the *name*—as it were, the *terminus technicus*, "technical goal," for the thing—which as such was meant to denote the *essence*, not the *degree*. Comp. Col. i. 9.

[6] As also by Rückert, Matthies, Meier, Holzhausen, Harless, Winzer, Olshausen, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel, Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 272.

[7] Flatt, following Heinsius, quite arbitrarily supplies *εἶναι*.

---

[1] ὕπεστί μοι θράσος ἀδυπνόων κλύουσαν ἀρτίως ὀνειράτων, Soph. *El.* 479 f.; Plat. *Lach.* p. 186 D; Thuc. v. 79. 1.

[2] Comp. Acts xxvi. 3. See, generally, Brunck, *ad Soph. l.c.*; Jacobs, *ad Athen.* p. 97; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Symp.* p. 176 D, and *ad Rep.* pp. 386 B, 500 C, 586 E; Kühner and Krüger, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 2. 1; Nägelsb. on *Iliad*, ed. 3, p. 181.

[3] 1 Thess. iii. 13; Phil. iii. 21; Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 897 f.; Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 690.

[4] Plat. *Pol.* vii. p. 533 D: τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄμμα, *Soph.* p. 254 A; comp. Ovid. *Met.* xv. 64, and see Grotius and Wetstein.

[5] In opposition to Harless.

[6] Comp. Clem. *ad Cor.* i. 19: ἐμβλέψωμεν τοῖς ὄμμασι τῆς ψυχῆς εἰς τὸ μακρόθυμον ὑτοῦ βούλημα, "Let us look with the eyes of our soul to his long-suffering will;" and i. 36: ἠνεῴχθησαν ἡμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας, "The eyes of our heart were opened."

[7] Olshausen, *Opusc.* p. 159; Stirm in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1834, 3, p. 53.

[8] Comp. Rom. i. 21; 2 Cor. iv. 6; Heb. iv. 12; Phil. iv. 7; 2 Pet. i. 19; and see, on the activity of the heart in thinking and cognition, Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 248 f., as also Krumm, *de notionib. psychol. Paul.* p. 50. The observation of the latter, that the *cognitive* activity of the heart is based on internal *experience* (which, however, holds good not only as to St. Paul, but also elsewhere in the N. T.), is not refuted by the rejoinder of Delitzsch, p. 177. In this very passage (comp. iii. 18) the cognition is not merely *discursive*, but the *experience*, in which it has its root, is that of the divine communication of the Spirit and enlightenment. Analogous is the case with 2 Cor. iv. 6. As to Phil. iv. 7, see on that passage. The heart, as the seat of self-consciousness and of the conscience, is the receptacle of experience and elaborates it. Comp. Beck, *bibl. Seelenl.* p. 67. If it does not admit the experience, or does not elaborate it unto saving knowledge, it is closed (Acts xiv. 16), hardened (Eph. iv. 18), slothful (Luke xxiv. 25), covered as with a veil (2 Cor. iii. 15), void of understanding, etc. See also Oehler in Herzog's *Encykl.* VI. p. 17.

---

[1] Comp. Rom. v. 2, viii. 18 ff. ; 1 Cor. ix. 24 ff. ; 2 Cor. iv. 17, xiii. 12 f. ; Gal. vi. 9 ; Phil. iii. 12 ff. ; Col. i. 23, iii. 1 ff.

[2] *Petrin. Lehrbegr.* p. 427.

[3] Comp. Col. i. 27 ; 2 Cor. iv. 17.

[4] As by Rückert, Harless, Winzer, Olshausen, but not by Koppe and de Wette.

Ver. 19 ff. After the object of the hope, there is now set forth also that *by which it is realized*, namely, the infinite power of God shown in the resurrection, etc., of Christ : *and what* (*quanta*, "how great") *is the exceeding* (surpassing all measure) *greatness of His power in relation to us who believe.* The *construction* is as in the preceding portion, and consequently such, that εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστ. attaches itself not to τῆς δυνάμ. αὐτοῦ,[1] but to the ἐστί to be mentally supplied after τί. — From the context preceding (ἐλπὶς κληρονομίας) and following (ver. 20 f.) it is clear that Paul is not here speaking of the power of God *already in the earthly life* manifesting itself as regards believers in their inward experience,[2] not even of this *as included*,[3] but only of the power to be shown as regards believers *in future at the Parousia*, where this mighty working displayed in Christ's resurrection, exaltation, and appointment as Head of the church, must necessarily, in virtue of their fellowship with Christ, redound to the fulfilment of the hope, to the δόξα τῆς κληρονομίας (see vv. 20–23). Hence Paul continues : κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν κ.τ.λ.] This is indeed connected by many with τοὺς πιστεύοντας,[4] in which case the πιστεύειν appeared as consequence of the ἐνέργεια κ.τ.λ., as ἔργον Θεοῦ—a view which was helped among the older expositors[5] by the interest of opposition to Pelagian and Socinian opinions ; but in this way the whole course of thought is deranged, and the simple and solemn exposition in ver. 20 is made subservient to an expression quite immaterial, which Paul might equally well have omitted (τοὺς πιστεύοντας). It is not the design, according to the connection, to prove the origin of faith. Chrysostom, Calvin, Calixtus, Estius, Grotius, and others, including Meier and Winzer, have found in κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργ. κ.τ.λ. an amplification[6] of τὸ ὑπερβ. μέγεθος κ.τ.λ. But in this way all that follows would only be destined to hold the disproportionate place of a *description*, and would be isolated from εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς, which yet was the definite basis of the discourse hitherto ; and this isolation there is no reason to assume. Hence we have to take κατὰ τ. ἐνέργ. κ.τ.λ. as *the ground of knowledge of the preceding point.* What is the exceeding greatness of the divine power towards believers, the readers are to know *in virtue of the operation*, etc. ; in accordance with this operation they were to measure that exceeding greatness. Harless refers it not merely to the preceding point, but to all the three points adduced after εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς. But, as the ἐνέργεια τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος, corresponds simply to the notion of the δύναμις, we are not entitled to refer farther back than to *the* point in which the δύναμις was spoken of. — τὴν ἐνέργ. τοῦ κράτ. τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ] a touching accumulation of terms, presenting the matter in *genetic* form; for ἰσχύς is *strength in itself* as inward power, as *vis* or *virtus* (Mark xii. 30; 2 Pet. ii. 11), κράτος, might *expressing itself* in overcoming resistance, in ruling, etc. (Luke i. 51; Acts xix. 20; Eph. vi. 10; Col. i. 11; Heb. ii. 14; Dan. iv. 27; Isa. xl. 26), and ἐνέργεια, the *efficacious working*, the *active exertion of power*.[1] The Vulgate aptly renders: "secundum *operationem potentiae virtutis* ejus," "according to the operation of the power of his virtue," and Bengel remarks: "τ. ἐνέργειαν, haec *actus* est, 'i.e., *an act*;' τοῦ κράτους, hoc *in actu* est,' 'i.e., *in act*.'"

---

[1] Meier, Harless, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek, after many older expositors; comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 4.

[2] Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Photius, Theophylact, Erasmus, and others, including Flatt, Matthies, Rückert, Meier, Harless.

[3] Schenkel.

[4] See Erasmus, Calovius, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Rückert, Matthies, and others.

[5] See, especially, Calovius.

[6] De Wette : the real ground ; comp. also Bleek.

Ver. 20. Ἣν] namely, ἐνέργειαν; see Winer, p. 205. — ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ] *in the case of Christ*. — ἐγείρας] aorist participle, contemporaneous with the act of the verb, like γνωρίσας, ver. 9.[2] — καὶ ἐκάθισεν] deviation from the participial construction after καί.[3] — ἐν τοῖς ἐπουραν.] *in the heaven* (see on ver. 3), is not to be transformed into the vague conception of a *status coelestis*, of a higher *relation* to the world, and the like,[4] but to be left as *a specification of place*. [See Note XIV., p. 353 seq.] For Christ is with glorified *body*, as σύνθρονος, "co-enthroned," of the Father on the seat where the Divine Majesty is enthroned (see on Matt. vi. 9), exalted above the heavenly angels (ver. 21), in heaven (Phil. iii. 20 f.); so Stephen beheld Him (Acts vii. 55), and the seer of the Apocalypse (Rev. v., *al.*); and from thence, surrounded by the angels, He will return, even as He has bodily ascended thither (1 Thess. iv. 16; Acts i. 11, iii. 21; 1 Pet. iii. 21 f.; Matt. xxiv. 30, xxv. 31); hence also those who arise and are changed at the Parousia are caught up εἰς ἀέρα, "into the air," to meet the Lord coming from heaven (1 Thess. iv. 17). Up to that time He intercedes for us at the right hand of the Father (Rom. viii. 34). The *true* commentary on ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρ. is accordingly, Mark xvi. 19: ἀνελήφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ. And our passage itself, ver. 20 ff. (comp. iv. 10), is the commentary on ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσε κ.τ.λ. Phil. ii. 9.

Ver. 21 is no parenthesis, since neither the construction nor the logical progress of the thought is interrupted. — ὑπεράνω expresses not the *infinite* exaltedness,[5] nor yet the *dominion over*,[6] although the latter is implied in the *nature of the case*, but simply: *up above* (Heb. ix. 5; Ezek. i. 26, viii. 2; Deut. xxviii. 1; Cant. tr. puer. 37; Tob. i. 3; Ael. *V. H.* ix. 7; Polyb. xii. 24. 1). The opposite is ὑποκάτω, Mark vi. 11; Heb. ii. 8. — πάσης ἀρχῆς . . . κυριότητος is neither to be understood, with Schoettgen, of the *Jewish hierarchs*, nor, with van Til,[1] of the various grades of *Gentile rulers*, nor, with Morus, of *human powers in general*, nor, with Erasmus, Vorstius, Wolf, Zachariae, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Olshausen, and others, of *quodcumque gloriae et dignitatis genus*, "any kind of glory and dignity" (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 24); but, as is shown by the immediate context (ἐκάθισεν . . . ἐν τοῖς ἐπουραν.) and the analogous passages, iii. 10, Col. i. 16, Rom. viii. 38 (comp. also 1 Pet. iii. 22), of the *angels*, who are designated according to their *classes of rank* (*abstracta pro concretis*, "abstracts for concretes"), and, in fact, of the *good* angels, since the apostle is not here speaking (as in 1 Cor. xv. 24) of the victory of Christ over *opposing* powers, but of His exaltation above the *existing* powers in heaven. See, moreover, on Rom. viii. 38. In opposition to Hofmann, who[2] would find in the different designations not any *order of rank*, but only various *relations to God and the world*, see Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 291 ff.[3] Christ Himself already, Matt. xviii. 10, assumes a diversity of rank among the angels; it is thus the more arbitrary, that expressions evidently in stated use, which in the case of two apostles and then in the *Test. XII. Patr.* correspond to this idea (even apart from the Jewish doctrine of classes of angels) should not be referred to it. More precise information, however, as to the relations and functions of the different grades of angels[4] is not to be given, since Paul does not himself enter into particulars on the point, and the Rabbinical theory of classes of angels, elaborated under the influence of Platonism, yet dissimilar,[5] is not in keeping with the designations of the apostle,[6] and has evidently been elaborated at a later date. It is nevertheless probable that the order of succession is here arranged according to a *descending climax;* for (1) the apostle, in looking at the matter, proceeds most naturally *from above downward*, from the right hand of God to the heavenly beings which hold the *next* place beneath Him, and so on; (2) the ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, and δυνάμεις are always mentioned in *the same* order (iii. 10; Col. i. 16, ii. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 22); the ἐξουσίαι, however, with the θρόνοι (Col. i. 16) are[7] placed in the seventh heaven, and the δυνάμεις only in the third (p. 547), as, indeed, in Jamblichus, v. 21, p. 136, the δυνάμεις are placed far below the ἀρχαί. According to this, the θρόνοι and κυριότητες, Col. i. 16, would be placed in juxtaposition as the two extremes of the angelic series. Another view is taken by Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 297 f. — That Paul, moreover, sets forth Christ as exalted above the angel-world, with a *polemic* purpose in opposition to the θρησκεία ἀγγέλων of the Gnosis of Asia Minor (comp. Col. ii. 18),[8] is not to be assumed, since the form of the representation maintains purely a *positive* character, and the thing itself was so natural to the Christian consciousness generally (comp. Heb. i. 4), and to the connection in the case of our passage in particular, as to need no polemic occasion in order to its being expressed, and expressed with such solemnity. Even a purpose *of guarding against* possible infection on the part of such a Gnosis[1] is at least not expressed or more specially indicated; it may, however, have still been partially present to the mind of the apostle from the sphere of thought of the previously composed Epistle to the Colossians. Comp. Introd. § 4. — *καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος κ.τ.λ.*] *and*, i.e., *and generally*,[2] *above every name which is named.* Let any name be uttered, whatever it is, Christ is above it, is more exalted than that which the name so uttered affirms. Comp. Phil. ii. 9. That *ὄνομα* is here *dignitatis potentiaeve nomen*, "a name of dignity or power,"[3] as Hom. *Od.* xxiv. 93; Strabo, vi. p. 245 (*ἐν ὀνόματι εἶναι*), and the like,[4] is not to be supposed on account of *ὀνομαζομένου*, since this makes the simple literal meaning *name* the only possible one;[5] and, if Morus and Harless[6] have supplied the notion underlying the preceding abstract nouns: "above every name, namely, of such character," they have done so arbitrarily, as *παντός* stands without restrictive addition. *πᾶν ὄνομα* is quite general: *any name whatever;* from the heavenly powers, above which Christ is placed, the glance of the apostle stretches to *every* (created) *thing generally*, which may anyhow be named. Comp. *πάντα*, ver. 22. — *οὐ μόνον κ.τ.λ.*] cannot belong to *ἐκάθισεν κ.τ.λ.*,[7] since *ἐκάθισεν* is an *act*, which *has taken place* in the *αἰὼν αὔτος*, but it belongs to *ὀνομαζομ.*: which is named in the present world-period, before the Parousia, and in the future one, after the Parousia. As to *αἰὼν οὗτος* and *αἰὼν μέλλων*, see on Matt. xii. 32. "Natural and supernatural order of the world,"[8] and similar conceptions, are not to be substituted for the historical idea.

---

[1] For similar combinations of words having a kindred sense, see Lobeck, *Paralip.* I. p. 534 f. Comp. Soph. *Philoct.* 590: πρὸς ἰσχύος κράτος. Job xxi. 23 (LXX.).

[2] In connection with this, observe the interchange of the perfect (ἐνήργηκεν, see the critical remarks) and the aorist (ἐγείρας): *which* (working) *He has wrought* (concluded action, regarded from the standpoint of the writer), *when He raised*, etc.

[3] See Hermann, *ad Soph. El.* p. 153, and note on Col. i. 6; Buttm. *neut. Gr.* p. 327 f. [E. T. 382].

[4] Calovius, Harless, Hofmann, and others.

[5] The Greek Fathers, Beza, Estius.

[6] Bengel.

---

[1] In Wolf.

[2] *Schriftbew.* I. p. 347.

[3] Comp. also Kahnis, *Dogm.* I. p. 558 f.

[4] Ignatius, *Trall.* 5, calls them τὰς τοποϑεσίας τὰς ἀγγελικάς. Comp. also Hermas, *Past.* i. 3, 4. But if the ἀρχαὶ κ.τ.λ. are *angels*, they are also conceived of as *personal*, not as "principles and potencies, powers, forces, ordinances, and laws" (Beyschlag, *Christol. d. N. T.* p. 244), consequently *in an abstract* sense. The abstract *designation* has its basis in the fact that *classes* or *categories* of personal beings are expressed, just as, *e.g.*, ἐξουσία is said of human *authorities*, which consist of *persons*.

[5] See Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenth.* II. p. 374; Bartolocci, *Bibl. Rabb.* I. p. 267 ff.; Gfrörer, *Jahrh. d. Heils*, I. p. 357 ff.

[6] See Harless *in loc.;* Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 226.

[7] *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 548.

[8] Bucer, Estius, Hug, and others.

Ver. 22. While Paul has before been setting forth *the exaltation of Christ over all things*, he now expresses the *subjection* therewith accomplished *of all things under Christ:* *καὶ πάντα . . . αὐτοῦ*, with which consequently the same thing—the installation into the highest *κυριότης* (Phil. ii. 10 f.)—is expressed, only from another point of view (from below, from the standpoint of the object subjected; previously from above, from the seat of the exalted Lord), in order to present it in a thoroughly exhaustive manner. Such a representation is not tautological, but *emphatic.* Theodoret, with whom Harless agrees, makes the purpose: *καὶ τὴν προφητικὴν ἐπήγαγε μαρτυρίαν*, "He also introduced the prophetical testimony." But the words, while doubtless a *reminiscence* of Ps. viii. 7 (6), in such wise that Paul makes the expression of the Psalm his own, are not a citation, since he does not in the least indicate this, as he has done at 1 Cor. xv. 27 by the following *ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ*. Certainly, however, he *recognized* that, which is said in Ps. viii. of *man* as such, as receiving its antitypical fulfilment in the exalted Christ (see on

---

[1] Schneckenburger, Olshausen.

[2] See Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* pp. 786, 870.

[3] Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, and others.

[4] See Wolf, *ad Dem. Lept.* p. 346; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* IX. p. 226.

[5] Comp. Plato, *Soph.* p. 262 B.

[6] Comp. also Michaelis and Rückert.

[7] Morus, Koppe; comp. already Beza and Zanchius.

[8] Schenkel.

1 Cor. *l.c.*, comp. also Heb. ii. 8), and thereby it was the more natural for him, when speaking here of the dominion of Christ, to appropriate the words of the Psalm. — *πάντα* has the emphasis, like *πάσης* and *παντός* before. All—all that is created — God has subjected to Christ. If Paul had meant simply all that *resists Christ*,[1] he must have *said* so, since there is no mention of subjecting what is hostile either before or in the eighth Psalm. — *καὶ αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ.*] *and Him*, the One thus exalted and ruling over all, *Him* even He gave, etc.; observe the emphasis of the *αὐτόν* prefixed. What *dignity* of the church in *Him!* — *ἔδωκε*] is usually taken in the sense of *τίθημι*;[2] but here as arbitrarily as at iv. 11. Grotius and Rückert rightly take it as: *He gave him . . . to the church.* If Paul had conceived of *τῇ ἐκκλ.* not as dependent on *ἔδωκε*, but as attached to *κεφ. ὑπὲρ πάντα*, it would be difficult to see why he should not have written *τῆς ἐκκλησίας*.[3] Comp. Col. i. 18. — *ὑπὲρ πάντα*] *exalted above all things*, is neither *transposed:*[4] "ipsum super omnia (*sc.* positum) dedit ecclesiae ut caput ejus," "He gave Himself placed above all things as Head of his Church," Grot.; nor does it signify *especially* (*ἐπὶ πᾶσιν*, vi. 16), as Boyd and Baumgarten would have it; nor is it, in its true connection with *κεφαλ.*, to be taken as *summum caput*, "the supreme head,"[5] by which, according to Koppe and Olshausen, it is meant to be indicated that Christ is higher than the apostles, bishops, etc. In opposition to this interpretation, it may be decisively urged that only One Head to the church can at all be thought of, and that *πάντα* here calls for the same explanation as above in the case of *πάντα ὑπέταξ*. Hence rather: *and Him He gave as Head over all things* (to which position, as just shown, He had exalted Him) *to the church* (Christians as a whole). Since He, *as Head over all things*, was given to the church, it is obvious that He was to belong to her in a very special sense *as* her own *Head;* hence it is, in accordance with a well-known *breviloquentia*,[6] unnecessary to supply *κεφαλήν* again before *τῇ ἐκκλ.*

Ver. 23 gives information (*ἥτις*, *ut quae*, "*as it is*," denotes the attribute as belonging to the nature of the *ἐκκλησία*; see Kühner, II. p. 497) as to the relation in which the *church* stands to this *Head* given to it. It is the *body* of the Head. — *τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ*] namely, in the mystical sense, according to the essential fellowship of spirit and of life, which unites the collective mass of believers with Christ, their Ruler, into an integrant and organic unity, wherein each single individual is a member of Christ in Christ's body. Comp. ii. 16, iv. 4, 12, 16, v. 23, 30; Col. i. 18, 24, ii. 19, iii. 15; Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 15, x. 17, xii. 13, 27. — *τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι*

---

[1] Grotius, Rosenmüller, Holzhausen, Olshausen.

[2] Harless: "and installed Him as Head over all things for the church;" comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 117.

[3] Hofmann indeed thinks that, if ἔδωκε τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ were to be taken together, Paul would not have inserted κεφαλ. ὑπὲρ πάντα. But why not? The very position assigned to κεφ. ὑπ. π., as placed apart from αὐτόν, is in keeping with the importance of this definition of quality, which at the same time, so placed, brings together with striking emphasis ὑπὲρ πάντα and τῇ ἐκκλ. Christ has He given as Head over *all things* to *the church.* So high and august is His esteem for it!

[4] Peshito, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Grotius, Estius, and others.

[5] Beza, Morus, Koppe, Rückert, Holzhausen, Meier, Olshausen, Bleek, comp. Matthies.

[6] Matthiae, p. 1533; Kühner, II. p. 602.

πληρουμ.] a significant explanatory parallel to *τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ*, which more precisely characterizes the relation of the church to Christ, in so far as the latter, as Head over all, is also *its* Head ; and that in *non-figurative* language. The church, namely, is *the Christ filled, i.e.*, that which is filled by Him,[1] in so far, namely, as Christ, by the Holy Spirit, dwells and rules in Christians, penetrates the whole Christian mass with His gifts and life-powers, and produces all Christian life (Rom. viii. 9, 10 ; 2 Cor. iii. 17 ; John xv. 5 ; Eph. iii. 17 ; Col. i. 27). His presence and activity, through the medium of the Spirit, fills the collective Christian body. And Christ, by whom the Christian church is filled, is the same *who filleth the all* (*i.e.*, the *rerum universitas*, "universe of things," whose Head He is, ver. 22) *with all*, for by Him was the world created, and by Him, as the immanent ground of life (Heb. i. 3), is it maintained and governed (1 Cor. viii. 6 ; Col. i. 16 ff. ; Usteri, *Lehrbegr.* p. 315 ff.) ; hence this interpretation of *ἐν πᾶσι* yields no intolerable sense,[2] but is entirely Pauline. Accordingly, by the fact that the church is named the *πλήρωμα* of Christ, the idea that Christ is the Head of the *church*, of His body, receives elucidation ; and by the characteristic designation *τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμ.*, is elucidated the conception, that He *as Head over all* is Head of the church, ver. 22. — *τὸ πλήρωμα* is here (comp. generally on ver. 10) equivalent to *τὸ πεπληρωμένον*, "that which is filled." Thus, as is well known, not only are ships' cargoes or crews,[3] but also the ships themselves—so far as they are freighted or manned—called *πληρώματα* ;[4] thus it is said in Philo, *de praem. et poen.* p. 920, of the soul : *γενομένη δὲ πλήρωμα ἀρετῶν* ; thus among the Gnostics the supersensible world is called *τὸ πλήρωμα*, *the filled*, in opposition to *τὸ κένωμα*, *the empty*, the world of the senses.[5] See also Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 470. *ἐν πᾶσι* is not : *everywhere*,[6] *in all modes of manifestation*,[7] *in all points*,[8] or the like ; but *instrumental*,[9] as at v. 18 : *with all ;* and *πληρουμένου* is *middle*, as in Xen. *Hell.* v. 4. 56, vi. 2. 14 ; Dem. p. 1208, 14 ; 1221, 12, in connection with which the medial sense is not to be overlooked : *qui sibi implet ;* for Christ is Lord and final aim (ver. 22 ; Col. i. 16 ; Heb. ii. 10) of all. Comp. Barnabas, *Ep.* 12 : *ἔχεις καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα καὶ εἰς αὐτόν*, "you have also in this the glory of Jesus ; for in Him and to Him are all things." The *ubiquity of the body of Christ*, which our text was formerly employed to defend (see especially Calovius), and even now is once more adduced to prove (Philippi, *Dogm.* IV. 1, p. 434), is the less to be found here, seeing that the ἐν πᾶσι, to be taken instrumentally, makes us think only of the all-penetrating continuous *activity* of Christ. [See on ver. 20, Note XIV., p. 353 seq.] The *continuity* of this activity is implied in the present πληρουμ., in which Hofmann, II. 1, p 539, finds a *gradual* development, and that of the *restoration* of the world ; of which last there is here no mention at all, but, on the contrary, of the *upholding* and *governing* of the world, as Col. i. 17 ; Heb. i. 3.[1] As regards the explanations that *differ* from ours, we may remark—(1) Many, who have rightly apprehended τὸ πλήρωμα and πληρουμένου, wrongly restrict τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι to *the spiritual operations in the Christians*, either, as Grotius : "Christus in omnibus, credentibus *sc.*, implet omnia, mentem luce, voluntatem piis affectibus, corpus ipsum obsequendi facultate, ad quae dona perpetua accedebant primis temporibus etiam χαρίσματα illa πνευματικά, etc.," "Christ in all, viz., believing fills all things, the mind with light, the will with godly dispositions, the very body with the power of obedience, to which perpetual gifts there were added in the first times also the spiritual χαρίσματα," etc., or, as Flatt (comp. Zachariae and Morus): "who fills all without distinction of nations, Jews and Gentiles, everywhere, or always [ἐν πᾶσι ?], with good." In this view the fact is overlooked that τὰ πάντα, after the preceding κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα, admits of no sort of limitation, and that, if τοῦ . . . πληρουμένου were designed only to say how far the church is the πλήρωμα of Christ, this whole addition would be quite as superfluous for the Christian consciousness as it would be indistinctly expressed. We have, on the contrary, in τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ κ.τ.λ. a climax of the representation, which advances from that which the *church* is in relation to Christ (τό πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ) to His relation *towards the universe* (hence, too, τὰ πάντα is prefixed).[2] (2) Since αὐτοῦ and τοῦ τὰ π. ἐν π. πληρουμ. are significantly parallel, and no change of subject is indicated ; and since, on the other hand, the thought, that the church is the πλήρωμα *of God*, would be inappropriate here, where the idea : *Christ* is its head, is dwelt on,—all explanations fall to the ground which refer τοῦ πληρουμ. to *God*, such as that of Theodoret : ἐκκλησίαν . . . προσηγόρευσε τοῦ μὲν Χριστοῦ σῶμα, τοῦ δὲ πατρὸς πλήρωμα· ἐπλήρωσε γὰρ αὐτὴν παντοδαπῶν χαρισμάτων κ.τ.λ., and of Koppe, by whom the sense is alleged to be : "the whole wide realm of the All-Ruler!" Comp. Rosenmüller. Homberg, *Parerg.* p. 289, Wetstein ("Christus est plenitudo, gloria patris omnia in omnibus implentis," "Christ is the fulness, the glory of the Father filling all in all"), and Meier refer the genitive to *God*, but regard τὸ πλήρωμα as apposition to αὐτόν ; Meier : "Him, the fulness of Him who filleth all in all ; for in Christ there dwells the fulness of God (Col. ii. 9), and it is God who fills the universe" (Jer. xxiii. 24, *al.*). This explanation is manifestly involved, makes ἥτις ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ an insertion which, if nothing further were to be added to it, would be after *ἔδωκε κεφαλὴν . . . τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* quite aimless and idle, and leaves *τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι* without more precise analysis. The same reasons hold also in opposition to Bengel, who regards *τὸ πλήρωμα* as *accusative absolute* (comp. on Rom. xii. 1), as *epiphonema* of what was said from ver. 20 onwards: "Hoc, quod modo explanavi, inquit apostolus, repraesentat nobis plenitudinem Patris omnia implentis in omnibus, ut mathematici dicunt: id quod erat demonstrandum," "What I have thus explained, the apostle says, represents to us the fulness of the Father filling all in all, as mathematicians say: 'that which was to be proved.'" (3) Since it is self-evident that Christ, as *Head* of the church, is not *without* this His body, and since it could not therefore enter the apostle's mind, at the solemn close, too, of the section, to bring forward the fact that the body belongs to the *completeness* of the head,—all those explanations fell to the ground as quite inappropriate which take *τὸ πλήρωμα* as *supplementum*, "the complement" (Matt. ix. 16; Mark ii. 21),[1] in which case some were consistent enough to take *πληρουμένου* likewise in the sense of completing, as Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Menochius, Boyd, Estius,[2] and others; and some inconsistent enough to explain it, incompatibly with the paronomasia, by *implere*, and thus differently from *πλήρωμα*, as Beza,[3] Calovius, comp. Calvin, Balduin, Baumgarten ; also Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* p. 219 f. : "His destination, to fill all in all, is *completely* attained only in the church." [See Note XV., p. 354.] (4) The necessity for taking *πλήρωμα* in one and the same sense is fatal to the explanation of *πλήρωμα* as equivalent to *πλῆθος*, *copia*, *coetus*, *numerosus*, "abundance, numerous assembly,"[1] or even : *full measure.*[2] Further, (5) the *passive* construction of *πληρουμένου* (Vulg.) leaves absolutely no tolerable explanation of *τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι* ; for which reason not only the exposition of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Estius, and others (see above, under No. 3), but also the similar one of Jerome[3] and that of Holzhausen, are to be rejected. The last-mentioned discovers the meaning : "Christ carries in Himself the fulness of eternal blessings" (*τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι*, signifying the eternal !). Yet, again, (6) seeing that *τὸ πλήρωμα* neither in itself nor in accordance with the context, denotes the Divine *δόξα*, "glory," of which the שכינה, "shekinah," was the real presence,[4] there falls to the ground not only the explanation of those who treat *τὸ πλήρωμα* as equivalent in meaning to *temple*, like Michaelis and Bretschneider, but also that of Harless : "the apostle designates the church with the same word, by which he elsewhere [?] designates the abundance of the glory dwelling in Christ and God, and issuing from Him. It, however, is the fulness of Christ, not as though it were the glory which dwelt in Him, but because He causes His glory to dwell, as in all the universe, so also in it. It is the glory, not of one who without it would starve, but of Him who fills the universe in all respects ;[5] *πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ γῆ δόξης αὐτοῦ*, "the whole earth

---

[1] Not, as Elsner (*Obss.* p. 204) would take it : *that by which Christ is filled*, against which there would be doubtless no linguistic objection (see Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 469 f.), but it may be urged that the church is not to be thought of as dwelling in Christ, but Christ as dwelling in the church (1 Cor. iii. 16 ; 2 Cor. vi. 12 ; Eph. ii. 22), and that the following paraphrastic designation of Christ would not be in keeping with that conception.

[2] Schenkel.

[3] Dem. 565, 1.

[4] Lucian, *V. H.* ii. 37, 38.

[5] Baur, *Gnosis*, pp. 157, 462 ff.

[6] Baumgarten-Crusius.

[7] De Wette, Bleek.

[8] Harless.

[9] Comp. Plut. *de plac. phil.* i. 7. 9 : ἐπλήρωτο ἐν μακαριότητι, "He was filled with blessedness." Paul himself has employed πληροῦν with such varied construction (with the dative, Rom. i. 29 ; with the genitive, Rom. xv. 14 ; with the accusative, Col. i. 9), that even the combination with ἐν cannot surprise us,—a combination which he has also in Phil. iv. 19.

---

[1] Comp. Hermas, *Past.* sim. iii. 9. 14.

[2] It is the more mistaken a course, in spite of this advance, yet again to refer ἐν πᾶσι to the *Christians.* This error has misled Schenkel to put into our passage the thought: "*in all members of the Christian community* [ἐν πᾶσι] *the Divine aim of the Creator, underlying the structure of the universe, receives its accomplishment through the life of the exalted Redeemer flowing into them.*" But little skill is attributed to the apostle, when it is supposed that he designed to express this thought by means of the words he has written.

---

[1] So also Schwegler in Zeller's *Jahrb.* 1844, p. 387, where, moreover, the comparison of the union of Christ and the church to marriage (v. 25 ff.) is brought in quite unwarrantably. As man and wife *supplement* each other to form the totality of the species (as head and body), so, too, the church (as the body of Christ) is held to be the *complementum*, "complement," of Christ (as the head of the church). Baur, too (*Paulus*, p. 426), takes the union of Christ with the church here as marriage (as a syzygy), and explains πλήρωμα entirely from the *Gnostic* point of view. By τὸ πλήρ. τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμ., in his view, nothing else is affirmed than that "Christ is the πλήρωμα (*the totality of the aeons*) in the highest absolute sense, in so far as it is all in an absolute manner (τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι), which He fills with Himself as the absolute contents thereof." Accordingly, πλήρωμα is to be taken neither simply in an active nor simply in a passive sense, but in such wise that the two notions pass over the one into the other; because, in fact, that which makes full is in turn that which is made full, that which is filled with its definite contents. "As πληρούμενος τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι, Christ is the πλήρωμα, filling the πάντα ἐν πᾶσι with its definite contents; and this πλήρωμα itself is the absolute totality filled with its absolute contents." Comp. Baur, *d. Christenth. d. drei ersten Jahrh.* p. 296, and *Neutest. Theol.* p. 258. Operations of this sort, which do not exegetically educe their results, but import them, are too much dominated by the presupposition of post-apostolic relations not to be safely left to their own fate, to which they have already been consigned.

[2] "Qui secundum omnia, s. quoad omnia in omnibus sui corporis membris adimpletur. Nisi enim essent hic quidem pes ejus, ille vero manus, alius autem aliud membrum . . . non perficeretur Christus secundum rationem capitis," "who is fulfilled as to all things in all members of His body. For unless this indeed were His foot, and that His hand, and another another member, Christ would not have been perfected according to the nature of a Head," Estius. He is followed by Bisping, who here finds the basis and germ of the doctrine of the treasure of the merits of the saints!

[3] "Omnino autem hoc addidit apostolus, ut sciamus Christum per se non indigere hoc supplemento, ut qui efficiat omnia in omnibus re vera," "But the Apostle added this entirely for the purpose that we should know that Christ of Himself does not need this supplement, since He truly effects all things in all," Beza. Calovius: "Tanto in pretio Christus suam habet ecclesiam, tam tenere amat, ut se quodammodo *imperfectum* et *mancum* reputet, nisi nobis conjungatur, et *nos ipsi* tanquam corpus capiti uniamur *ceu πλήρωμα ejus*," "In such value does Christ have His church, so tenderly does He love it, that He accounts Himself

---

imperfect and *defective* unless joined to us, and we ourselves united as a body to the Head, as its *πλήρωμα*. Comp. Luther's gloss ; also *Apol. Conf. A*, p. 145. Calvin, moreover, prefers to limit *τὰ πάντα* to the *spiritualis gubernatio ecclesiae*, "spiritual government of the church."

[1] Storr, Morus, Stolz, Koppe, Rosenmüller. Morus : "Quae proinde est societas subditorum ejus et hominum magna copia, quae colit hunc (quae subest huic, quae sub hoc rege vivit), qui omnes omnino in hoc coetu omnibus generibus bonorum accumulare de die in diem solet," "Which is, accordingly, the fellowship of His subjects, and the large number of men, that worships Him (that is beneath Him, that lives under this King), who is wont from day to day in this assembly to increase all men with all kinds of blessings." Rosenmüller : "Coetus numerosus illius, qui omnes (homines) omnibus bonis replet," "The numerous assembly of Him, who fills all men with all blessings," by which *God* is held to be meant.

[2] Cameron, Bos.

[3] "Sicut adimpletur imperator, si quotidie ejus augetur exercitus, . . . ita et Dominus noster Jesus Christus in eo, quod sibi credunt omnia et per dies singulos ad fidem ejus veniunt, ipse adimpletur in omnibus, sic tamen, ut omnia adimpleantur in omnibus, *i.e.*, ut qui in eum credunt, cunctis virtutibus pleni sint," "Just as the emperor is fulfilled, if his army is increased daily . . . so also our Lord Jesus Christ is Himself fulfilled in all, in this, that they entrust all things to Him, nevertheless so that all are fulfilled in all, *i.e.*, that those who believe in Him are full of all virtues."

[4] Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 2394 ff.

[5] According to Harless, *ἐν πᾶσι* means *in every way*, and implies that not in *one* way (only) is the sphere of earth full of the glory of Christ ; the glory of the Creator is one, that of the Enlightener before the incarnation (John i. 3) another, that of the Redeemer another. But how is the limitation of *τὰ πάντα* to the *earth* to be justified? And are, then, these *three* modes of glory adduced, which after all the reader must have *guessed at* without any hint, sufficient to exhaust the quite unlimited *ἐν πᾶσι*? and is the thought of the glory of the Creator and the Enlightener *before the incarnation* in keeping with the *present* participle? The whole explanation pours into the simple words a series of thoughts and reservations, in presence of which the words remain a very riddle of the Sphinx.

is full of His glory" (Isa. vi. 3) ; but it is the *glory* of Christ, because He is united with it alone, as the head with its body." Lastly, (7) Rückert also proved unsuccessful in his attempt to explain it : the church, in his view, is designated as the means (*τὸ πλήρωμα*, that whereby the *πληροῦν* comes about) by which Christ carries out in all (*πᾶσι*, *masculine*) that which is committed to Him for completion (*τὰ πάντα*), as "the means of His accomplishing the great destination which devolves upon Him, namely, the universal restoration and bringing back to God." Against this may be urged both the language itself, since *τὸ πλήρωμα* never signifies the means of accomplishment, and the context, which neither speaks of a restoration and bringing back to God nor furnishes any limitation of *τὰ πάντα* to that which is implied in the divine plan. — We may add that there cannot be shown here as regards the use of *πλήρωμα*, any more than previously as regards the classes of angels, any direct or indirect polemic preference to Gnosticism. To the later speculations of Gnosticism, however, the forms of the transcendent doctrines of the apostle could not but be welcome ; not as if Gnosticism had thought out its material in accordance with such Scriptural forms,[1] but it poured in into their mould, and, moreover, further developed and amplified the forms which it found ready to hand.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

II. Ver. 3. *ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου.*

Schmidt in the revised Meyer here dissents, and refers to Braune's argument, who contends that the joining of *κυρίου* to the *ὁ Θεὸς*, as well as to *πατὴρ*, is most natural, especially as *πατὴρ* does not require, as Meyer states, a complementary genitive, see Eph. v. 20 ; 1 Cor. xv. 24, xvi. 23 ; Gal. i. 1 ; 1 Thess. i. 1 ; 2 Tim. i. 2. Neither is the expression "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ" so isolated, ver. 17 ; Matt. xxvii. 46 ; John xx. 17 ; Rev. ii. 7, iii. 12. The Vatican manuscript omits *καὶ πατὴρ*. Eadie, Alford, Barry, Riddle concur in this construction. Ellicott, on the other hand, inclines to Meyer, while acknowledging that the other interpretation is both exegetically and doctrinally tenable.

III. Ver. 35. *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.*

The emphasizing of any local relation here gives a wrong shade to the argument. Meyer's plea that the *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις* must be interpreted according to the meaning of the expression as found in the other five places it occurs in this Epistle, if viewed with respect to local relations, would introduce a singular interpretation from chap. vi. 12. A more general explanation is better ; "What belongs to heaven in contrast to what belongs to and is on earth" (Braune). *Ἐπουράνιος* "signifies what *pertains to heaven* as to a higher and more divine order of things," 1 Cor. xv. 40, 48, 49 ; Heb. xii. 22 ; Eph. i. 20 ; 1 John iii. 12. *τὰ ἐπουρ.*, as against *τὰ ἐπίγεια*, that order of things which includes the blessings of complete salvation. So *κλῆσις ἐπουράνιος*, Heb. xiii. 1, *δωρεὰ επουρ.*, vi. 4 ; xi. 16.

---

[1] Tertull. *de praescr.* 38.

Hence *τὰ επουράνια* denote *those blessings collectively*, Eph. i. 3, ii. 6 ; Heb. viii. 5, ix. 23 ; Phil. ii. 10, *οἱ επουρ.*, things which come within the range of this order'' (Cremer's Lexicon of N. T. Greek., Eng. Trans. (1878), p. 468). "These spiritual blessings are truly *επουράνια*, with respect to their *origin*, since they descend from the Father, who is *επουράνιος*, Matt. xviii. 35 ; with respect to their *quality*, because in dignity and eminence they are neither earthly nor heavenly with respect to the earthly and material heavens, but supercelestial, which even the angels in heaven delight to 'look into,' as they are truly 'above thought, above word, above every comprehension of a created nature ;' and with respect to *end*, because not only in the kingdom of grace on this earth, but also in the kingdom of glory in heaven, we enjoy the blessedness acquired in Christ'' (Calovius).

IV. Ver. 4. *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.*

Chrysostom's note on the etymology of *καταβολῆς* (a *casting down*) is interesting : "Beautiful is that word, as though he were pointing to the world as cast down from some vast height. Yea, vast indeed and ineffable is the height of God, so far removed, not in place, but in incommunicableness of nature ; so wide the distance between creation and creator !'' Weiss (Bibl. Theol., Eng. Trans., vol. II., p. 98) suggests the argument contained here for the divinity of Christ : "If Christians are chosen in Him before the foundation of the world, and are thereby already blessed in Him in the heavenly world, then the Mediator of salvation, in whom the election and the blessing could be grounded at a time when the objects of these did not exist, must have Himself existed before the world. . . For Paul there is at once an eternal divine existence of the Christ who in His earthly life has become the Mediator.'' So also Bengel. The superiority of Christianity to Judaism is also indicated : "The Jews dated their election from Abraham, and boasted of its antiquity'' (Grotius). But "the election in Christ preceded the election of the Jewish nation in their forefathers; and redemption, the verification of the archetype of humanity through Christ, and proceeding from Him, is the end of the whole terrestrial creation, so that everything else appears as a preparation for this highest object in the counsel of creation in reference to the world'' (Neander's Planting and Training of Chr. Church, American edition, p, 479).

V. Ver. 4. *ἅγιους καὶ ἅμωμους.*

The reference of these words by Meyer to forensic righteousness is much disputed, though supported by Braune, Olshausen, and Harless. So too Philippi (*Kirchliche Glaubenslehre*, v. 1, p. 278) : "Justification consists in the negative *ἄφεσις τῶν παραπτωμάτων*, the positive *ἁγίους καὶ αμώμους εἶναι*, and reception into the *υἱοθεσία*.'' Ellicott is in doubt as to whether the reference is to justification or sanctification, inclining, however, to the latter, which is maintained by Estius, Boyd, Stier, Alford, Eadie, Barry, Riddle. As justification, however, is not a subordinate end to sanctification, and the inherent righteousness of the believer, however perfect in its final stage, is incomparable with the imputed righteousness of the Redeemer, with which he is clothed in justification, we cannot appreciate the exceptions taken to Meyer's view. If the result that emerges in time is that Christ became a curse for us (Gal. iii. 13) and we are made the righteousness of God in Him (2 Cor. v. 21), there is nothing inconsistent in regarding the eternal purpose that we should be holy and blameless before Him, as directed to that putting on of Christ whereby all that He is becomes ours. In the world of glory it is the forensic righteousness that is the special theme of the hymns of the church triumphant, Rev. i. 6, vii. 14.

VI. Ver. 5. *προορίσας ἡμᾶς.*

Other distinctions have been drawn between the *ἐκλέγεσθαι* and the *προορίζειν*: " 'They differ only in an ordinative and objective manner,' the *ἔκ* of the former referring to the mass from whom the selection was made, the *πρό* of the latter to the pre-existence and priority of the decree" (Scherzer in Ellicott.) "The matter to be considered when *προορίζειν* is used, is not *who* are the subjects of this predestination, but *what* they are predestined to. This second object of the verb, as it has been called, forms an essential part of the conception expressed by it; what is called the first object, *i.e.*, the persons who, is an accidental one, a contingency belonging to history, whereas *προορίζειν* itself precedes history."

VII. Ver. 5. *εἰς αὐτόν.*

"We may thus paraphrase: 'God predestinated us to be adopted as His sons; and that adoption came to us through Christ, and was to lead us unto and unite us to God'" (Ellicott).

VIII. Ver. 7. *τῶν παραπτωμάτων.*

Meyer's inference is here too sweeping. That the inborn sinfulness is not here designated must be conceded. But the *τὰ παραπτωμάτα* as the concrete manifestation of the sinful habit, may readily be used by synecdoche for everything in man that incurs God's wrath. See Cremer's Lexicon of N. T. Greek (Eng. Trans., 1878, p. 499): "In *παραπτώμα* reference is especially made to the *subjective passivity and suffering* of him who misses or falls short of the enjoined command; and the word has come to be used both of great and serious guilt, and generally of all sin, even though unknown and unintentional (Ps. xix. 13; Gal. vi. 1), so far as this is simply a missing of the right. . . . Like its verb, *παράπτωμα* is used synonymously with *ἁμαρτία* as the generic word, Rom. v. 20, and is thus a *missing of the mark*, and includes both *ἁμαρτία* and *παράβασις*."

IX. Ver. 10. *εἰς οικονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος.*

Harless traces the confusion concerning this passage to three sources: 1. Incorrect translation of *εἰς* (when regarded as standing for *ἐν*). 2. Incorrect understanding of *οἰκονομία* (dispensation of grace). 3. Wrong construction of the genitive, *πληρώματος*. Cremer defines *οἰκονομία* as denoting "either (1) actively, *the administrative activity* of the owner or of the steward; or (2), passively, *that which is administered*, the administration or ordering of the house, or the arrangement, *e.g.*, of a treatise or discourse" (Plutarch). He finds the object of *οἰκονομίαν* not in the *τοῦ πληρώματος*, but in the relative *ἣν προέθετο*, which results in the paraphrase: "The administration of God's saving purpose pertaining to the fulness of the times," "administration" being taken in its passive sense. (Lexicon of N. T. Greek, E. T., 1878, p. 480 sq.). Weiss (Bibl. Theol. of N. T., II. p. 79) adopts the temporal meaning of *οἰκονομίαν*, to which Harless so strongly objects, viz., a "fixed period, in which the measure of the ages that are past was to become complete." Barry, on the other hand, concurs with Cremer: "Which He purposed in Himself for administration (or disposal) of the fulness of the (appointed) seasons, to gather," etc.

X. Ver. 10. *ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα.*

The *τὰ πάντα* is limited by Philippi (Kirch. Dog. III. 393), and Hodge, "to the redeemed," by Boyd to the "elect," while, according to Calovius, all men are comprised in the *ἀνακεφαλαίωσις*, with respect to God's intention and Christ's merit, but it becomes restricted by the guilt of man's unbelief. Better Eadie: "Man is reconciled to God, and all who bear God's image are reconciled to man. Angels are 'ministering spirits' to him, and all holy intelligences delight in him. Not only has harmony been restored to the universe, and the rupture occasioned by sin repaired, but beings still in rebellion are placed under Christ's control, as well as the unconscious elements and spheres of nature. This summation is seen in the form of the government: Jesus is universal Regent." Hunnius (quoted by Calovius) presents the relation of this *ἀνακεφαλαιωσις* to the angels: "Although nothing is obtained for the angels by Christ's death, yet something is obtained for all that has a certain relation to the angels, in that the angels, who formerly were alienated from men by transgression, now acknowledge them again as their fellow-servants, associates, and fellows of the same joy and kingdom, and, therefore, do not disdain to serve them."

XI. Ver. 11. *εκληρώθημεν.*

The Eng. Rev. Vers., following Bengel, de Wette, Stier, Alford, Ellicott, Braune, translates "we were made a heritage."

XII. Ver. 13. *ἐσφραγίσθητε.*

"By the term '*sealing*' is not meant the first production of faith, but its ulterior progress and confirmation" (Boyd). "*ἡ σφραγὶς* is undoubtedly used by ecclesiastical writers simply for baptism, but any special reference of this nature would not appear in harmony with the present context" (Ellicott). "The reception of the Spirit," after faith mentioned by Meyer, must necessarily be understood of fuller bestowals of the Spirit, since faith itself is His work.

XIII. Ver. 17. *ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ.*

ἐπιγνώσις, "always of a knowledge which very powerfully influences the form of religious life . . . Thus, as Delitzsch says (Ep. to Hebrews), we may speak of a false *γνῶσις*, but not of a false *ἐπιγνώσις*" (Cremer).

XIV. Ver. 20. *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.*

In Note III. we have indicated that such local restriction is too contracted. So here. The *δεξία αυτοῦ* is God's universal power, Ps. xliv. 3; cxviii. 15, 16; cxxxix. 10. Yet this must not be so understood as to deny the reality of Christ's ascension, or to ascribe to His exalted body a diffusion throughout all space. Chemnitz, the great expounder of the position maintained by Harless, says (*De Duabus Naturis*, p. 178): "We by no means hold, that either in union or in glory, with its substance lost and its essential properties abolished, the body of Christ is converted or changed into a spiritual, infinite, immense substance, uncircumscribed by any essential property, so as, by reason of its essential, infinite immensity, to be in all places and fill all things, as divinity is in this manner everywhere present . . . (p. 176) By, and of itself, even in glory, it is limited by the property of its nature, and in the manner of glorified bodies is somewhere, the privilege of the hypostatic union excepted. . . . Yet it must be added that Christ, either in glory or the former natural form, is not so held and confined in heaven, as not to be able, whenever He wishes, to afford also on earth His presence after that form." In other words, the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum* does not involve the denial of an ordinary local relation of our Lord's body to a heavenly sphere, although it is maintained that the *ἐν τοὶς ἐπουρανίοις* implies what transcends all limitations of space. Harless refers here, with great approval, to Tholuck on Matt. vi. 9. The term "ubiquity," in this relation as used by Meyer, chap. iv. 10, and foot-note to chap. vi. 31, is a misnomer. See Krauth's Conservative Reformation, p. 495 sq.

XV. Ver. 23. *τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ κ.τ.λ.*

Schmidt inserts in Meyer, 5th ed., the following from Weiss' Bibl. Theol. of N. T., II 112: "Not only does the church, as the body, stand in need of Christ, as the head, but the apostle ventures the bold expression that Christ also needs the church, as the body, as that which belongs to His completeness, or makes his being first entirely complete." On this Cremer remarks: "An ingenious thought, but not so true."

CHAPTER II.

Ver. 1. After *ἁμαρτίαις*, B D E F G ℵ, min. Syr. utr. Erp. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. It. Theodoret, Lucif. Victorin. Ambrosiast. Pel. have *ὑμῶν*, which Lachm. and Tisch. have rightly received into the text. On account of the redundancy of the pronoun and its absence in ver. 5, the omission of it was easier than its addition from a comparison of Col. ii. 13 (in opposition to Reiche). — Ver. 3. *τέκνα φύσει*] Lachm. and Rück. read *φύσει τέκνα*, following A D E F G L, min. Vulg. It. Or. (once), and other Fathers. But considering how closely *τέκνα ὀργῆς* go together, the transposition *φίσει τέκνα* was so natural, that in opposition to these important witnesses the *Recepta*, attested by B K ℵ, most min. Or. (thrice) Chrys. Dam. Theophyl. Oec., is, with Matth. Scholz, Harless, Olsh. de Wette, Tisch. [Treg. Hofm. Braune, West. and Hort] to be maintained. — Ver. 11. The order *ποτὲ ὑμεῖς* in Lachm. and Tisch. is justified by A B D* E ℵ* codd. of It. and Fathers. More feebly attested is the order *ἐγεν. ἐγγύς*, ver. 13, in Lachm., which weakens the antithesis. — Ver. 12. *ἐν τῷ καιρῷ*] *ἐν* is wanting in decisive witnesses. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. Explanatory addition. — Ver. 15. *ἐν ἑαυτῷ*] Lachm. [West. and Hort] : *ἐν αὐτῷ*. The witnesses are greatly divided. But E was easily passed over after Eν. — Ver. 17. *καὶ τοῖς*] Lachm. Tisch. Rück. : *καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς*, according to decisive testimony. The emphasis of the repetition of *εἰρήν.* was not duly regarded, and so the apparently redundant word was neglected. For the same reason there was written in ver. 19, instead of the far preponderantly attested *ἀλλ' ἐστέ*, simply *ἀλλά* (Elz. Scholz). — Ver. 21. *πᾶσα οἰκοδ.*] Elz. Scholz, Rück. Reiche read *πᾶσα ἡ οἰκοδ.* But the article is wanting in B D E F G K L ℵ* and many min., also in Clem. Bas. Chrys. (in the commentary) Theodoret, Oec., and was added (A C, Chrys. Theophyl.) because it seemed needed by the sense. See, however, the exegetical remarks.

Contents.—You also, when ye were dead through sins,—as indeed we Jewish-Christians too were in the same condition of sin and subjection to the divine wrath,—God has by virtue of His love made us alive with Christ, raised us and transferred us into heaven, in order, in the world-ages to come, to show His grace towards us in Christ (vv. 1–7). For out of grace have ye attained to salvation, not through merit of works (vv. 8–10). Remember, therefore, that ye were formerly as Gentiles unhallowed and unhappy, but now through the death of Christ ye are in quite a different position (vv. 11–13). For Christ has through His death established peace between Jews and Gentiles (vv. 14–18). Ye, consequently, are no longer aliens, but fellow-members of the theocracy, members of the household of God, built up upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, wherein the corner-stone is Christ, in whom every building is built, and ye too, unto a holy temple (vv. 19–22).

Ver. 1. *Connection:* After Knatchbull and others[1] had attached *καὶ ὑμᾶς* to *εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας*, i. 19, and Bengel to *ἣν ἐνήργ.*, i. 20 (both arbitrarily confusing, and the former also mistaken, for the reason that *ἡμᾶς*, ver. 19, already included the readers), Lachmann and Harless have closed i. 23 with only a comma, and annexed *καὶ (συνεζωοποίησε) ὑμᾶς καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκε κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 22.[2] So also de Wette, without, however, approving the mere comma after i. 23. But in this way we should have to expect not *ὑμᾶς*, but *ἡμᾶς* (comp. i. 19: *εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας*), for Paul would attach to what God has done in relation *to Christ* that which He has at the same time done *in the case of the Christians.* And, inasmuch as he has employed the pronoun of the *second* person, he has thereby indicated the beginning of a *new* portion. Moreover, i. 23 is so majestic and solemn in import and form, that it is admirably suited for a sonorous *conclusion*, but hardly for a mere parenthetic insertion. No, after the apostle has previously spoken of the exceeding power of God in the case of believers, which may be recognized by virtue of what He has done in the case of Christ, whom He raised, exalted, etc., he wishes now, *in application of this to the readers*, to bring the latter to the consciousness that God has made *also them* (*καὶ ὑμᾶς*), when they were dead in their sins, to be alive, etc., with Christ, and thus has shown *also in their case* that exceeding power. — The *construction* is *broken off*, even before the subject and the verb are expressed, by the afflux of the thoughts in the relative clauses which begin ver. 2, but is resumed ver. 4 by means of *δέ*, so that the subject not yet named in ver. 1 is at length named and characterized in ver. 4; and in ver. 5 the verb (*συνεζωοποίησε*) comes in with repetition of the object, which, however,—in accordance with what has been said in the intervening clauses,—had already in ver. 4 passed over into the first person and thus become universal (*ἡμᾶς*). As to the details, see below. The resumption accordingly begins already, in ver. 4, with *ὁ δὲ Θεός*;[3] not first with ver. 5, as Wolf and others, including Griesbach, Koppe, ed. 1, Scholz, Meier, Rückert, Holshausen, would have it, because otherwise ver. 4 in turn would be anacoluthic, and yet *ὁ Θεός* is the subject of *συνεζωοπ.* — *νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτ. κ. τ. ἁμαρτ. ὑμῶν*] The *dative* denotes the *causa efficiens*, "efficient cause," of the death. The expression with *ἐν*, Col. ii. 13, is not equivalent. Quite at variance with the context, Cajetanus[4] holds that the dative is as in Rom. vi. 11, in which case the force of *ὄντας* as a *present* participle is urged: *since ye are dead for the sins.* *ὑμῶν* also is against this, as well as the plural, since in the being dead for sin the latter appears as principle (Rom. vi. 11).—A *real* distinction between *παραπτώματα* and *ἁμαρτίαι* does not exist,[5] in so far as both expressions denote the same thing (the *pec-*

---

[1] Mentioned by Wolf, *Cur.* on i. 19

[2] Calovius, Cramer, Koppe, and Rosenmüller attached *καὶ ὑμᾶς* immediately to i. 23, namely, to *πληρουμένου*: qui sicut omnes alios beneficiis cumulat, sic etiam vos," "who, just as he loadens all others with his favors, so also loadens you," Rosenmüller, This, however, is entirely incompatible with the correct explanation of *τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμένου*, i. 23, and with the correlation of *νεκρούς* and *συνεζωοπ.*

[3] As even Theophylact expressly observes.

[4] Not Estius, who *rejects* this explanation.

[5] Augustine, *ad Lev.* qu. 20, makes the former denote the *desertio boni*, "desertion of good," the latter the *perpetratio mali*,

cata actualia, "actual sins," in thought, word, and deed) in a twofold form of conception as "missing" and "fall;"[1] and the abstract ἁμαρτίαις cannot mean, like ἡ ἁμαρτία at Rom. v. 20, sin *in abstracto*, "in abstract," as ruling *power*, but in virtue of the plural can only mean the *actual* sins (ἁμαρτήματα); comp. on Rom. v. 20.[2] — ὄντας] state, which was present *at the time, when* God made them alive. — νεκρούς] is understood by the expositors (apart from those who, like Koppe and Rosenmüller, substitute for the literal meaning the notion of *wretched, miserable*) of *spiritual* death (comp. v. 14), *i.e.*, of the deadness of true moral life through the "alienatio animae a Deo," "alienation of mind from God," Calvin.[3] But by what, we ask, is this spiritual sense indicated? Must not νεκρ. τοῖς παραπτ. κ. ταῖς ἁμαρτ. have reminded the readers quite naturally and necessarily of the connection, well known to them, between unexpiated sins and *the eternal death* (the eternal condemnation),—a connection, in which they once as Gentiles shared? See on Rom. vi. 16, 22 f., vii. 9–11, 24, viii. 2, 6. [See Note XVI., p. 398.] The explanation of *physical* death is inadmissible, because this is a consequence not of individual sins, but of the sin of Adam; see on Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 22. The expression νεκροί is *proleptic:* when ye were dead through your sins, *i.e.*, when you had through your sins drawn upon you death, had become *liable to eternal death*, so that in this way the *certo morituri*, "those who are surely to die," are designated as νεκροί. Comp. Rom. vii. 10, viii. 10, and the well-known ψυχάριον εἶ βαστάζον νεκρόν, "you are a soul carrying a dead body," Epict. *Anton.* iv. 41. See also on Col. ii. 12. Without Christ, the everlasting death, which they had incurred by their sins, would not be annulled and averted from them; but, after that Christ has completed the work of atonement and they have become believers in Him, eternal life has become the portion of those who were by their sins liable to eternal death, and that by means of the fellowship of life, into which they are brought through faith with the Christ who is made alive from the dead, raised, and exalted to heaven, which is more fully expressed, vv. 5, 6, by συνεζωοποίησε τῷ Χριστῷ κ.τ.λ. Thus the passage certainly treats of the *atonement* accomplished by Christ, to which believers owe eternal life (see vv. 7, 8). The *moral* restoration[4] is the *consequence* of the atonement (ver. 10), the ethical produce of the same through the Spirit. — The relation, we may add, of our passage to Col. ii. 13 and i. 21 is not that of a servile dependence, but that of a fresh and living remembrance, with new and peculiar amplification.

"perpetration of evil," or the former to be the sin of rashness, the latter that which is deliberate, which last distinction is adopted also by Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 47. Jerome makes the former *delicta cogitatione inchoata*, "offences begun in thought," the latter *sins of deed;* comp. Olshausen. Bengel: παραπτ. applies to the *Jews*, and ἁμαρτ. to the *Gentiles*. Meier (comp. Baumgarten-Crusius): the two words are distinguished as *act* and *state*. Matthies: the former are *mental* errors and obscurations, the latter *moral* sins and vices. Harless and de Wette: the former denotes single *transgressions*, the latter *all kinds* of sins, including sins in *thought*.

[1] See, generally, Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 324.

[2] See Note VIII. on chap. i. 7.

[3] Comp. Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 127.

[4] Hofmann.

Ver. 2. Shadows before the light which arises in ver. 4. — ἐν αἷς] *domain, in which*, etc. It is the pre-Christian *sphere of life*, and then follows (κατὰ κ.τ.λ.) the *normal* standard which rules in it. αἷς has shaped itself after the gender of the last substantive, but embraces both.[1] — κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου] *according to the age of this world, i.e.*, as was in keeping with the period of time appointed for the present world (subsisting up to the Parousia). For immorality is the characteristic of this world-period (Rom. xii. 2 ; 2 Cor. iv. 4 ; Eph. vi. 12) in contrast to the future new world, in which δικαιοσύνη bears sway, and the nearer the Parousia, the more the αἰών is πονηρός (see on Gal. i. 4 ; comp. ver. 16, and on vi. 13). Others explain αἰών as *life* ;[2] for which Rückert—who, in a strangely erroneous way, explains it as equivalent to κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦτον τοῦ κόσμου—and Matthies put : *spirit of the time*, and Olshausen : *tendency of the time* ; comp. Bleek. But, however current αἰών in the signification of *life* may be in classical Greek, especially in Homer, Pindar, Herodotus, and the tragic poets,[3] yet in the N. T., often as the habitually used word recurs, it is never so employed, but always in the signification of *juncture of time, age.* The shift to which Koppe has recourse,[4] that αἰών and κόσμος are synonymous—hence Koppe makes ὁ αἰὼν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου equivalent to ὁ κόσμος οὗτος—stands on a level with the capricious inversion of Bretschneider, who makes it tantamount to ὁ κόσμος τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου : *homines pravi ut nunc sunt*, "wicked men as they now are." No, Paul might have written briefly κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦτον (comp. i. 21) ; but, in accordance with the graphic amplification of the passage carrying such terrible emphasis, he has paraphrased this τοῦτον by τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. According to Beausobre and Michaelis ("the God of this world"), αἰὼν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου is meant to denote the *devil* in polemic reference to the Gnostic doctrine of aeons (see what follows). According to Baur, p. 433 f., the expression itself is a Gnostic one, equivalent to the κοσμοκράτωρ (comp. vi. 12), and denoting the *devil.* But this is imported, inasmuch as the explanation of αἰών in the sense usual in the N. T. yields quite a Pauline thought. The *devil* appears only in *what follows*, and would, if he was to be designated already here, and that as Lord of the pre-Messianic period, have been designated, as at 2 Cor. iv. 4, as ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, or in a like concrete manner. — κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος] climactic parallel to the preceding. "Sic res fit expressior," "Thus the subject becomes more explicit," Bengel. The opposite is κατὰ Θεόν, iv. 24 ; 2 Cor. vii. 9. Comp. 1 John v. 14 : κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ. The *devil* Paul here represents as *the ruler over the might of the air*, in which ἐξουσια is *collective*, denoting the totality of the mighty ones (the demons, Matt. xii. 24) concerned.[5] This ἐξουσία has its seat in the air, which exists between heaven and earth (τοῦ ἀέρος) ; the atmosphere, pertaining, in contrast to the higher pure αἰθήρ,[6] still to the physical realm of earthly things (γῆς ἰσόμοιρος ἀήρ, "earth's equal partner, air," Soph. *El.* 87), is the seat, the territory of the might of the demons. This and nothing else Paul expresses in distinct words, the ἐναέριος διατριβή, "aerial life,"[1] the ὑπουράνιος τόπος, "sub-celestial place,"[2] of the demons; and neither ought τοῦ ἀέρος to have been taken[3] as equivalent to τοῦ σκότους, "darkness" (vi. 12; Col. i. 13), because, though it may, as it often does in Homer, denote *misty gloom*, clouds, etc., in contradistinction of the pure αἰθήρ, it never takes the place of the absolute σκότος,[4] and in the N. T. always means simply *air;* nor ought it to have been explained by a metonymy as *mundus*, "the world."[5] According to Hahn,[6] τοῦ ἀέρος is designed to express the aeriform *nature* of the demons; they are not really *spiritual*, but only *spirit-like; aeriformness* is their physical constitution. This is already in itself incorrect, since the demons must of necessity have the same physical constitution as the angels (including also their supra-terrestrial corporeity, comp. on Matt. xxii. 30), and hence, although they have become ἀκάθαρτα, "incorruptible," they have yet remained πνεύματα, see in this very Epistle, vi. 12 (τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας). Olshausen would remove the demons from the atmosphere by taking ἀήρ as equivalent to οὐρανός,[7] appealing to 1 Thess. iv. 17 (where, however, ἀήρ is nothing else than *air*), and even giving out this passage as the only one in the N. T. where the word ἀήρ elsewhere occurs (but see Acts xxii. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 26, xiv. 9; Rev. ix. 2, xvi. 17). As an equally exemplary companion-piece of rationalizing artifice may be quoted the interpretation of Stolz:[8] "We have here to think of the rational beings acting and walking *upon the earth*, of men, who as sensuous creatures *breathe in the air*, in the atmosphere surrounding the earth." Hofmann, who elsewhere took ἀήρ erroneously as equivalent to πνεῦμα, whould now[9] not less erroneously make τοῦ πνεύματος dependent upon τοῦ ἀέρος, and by the latter understand *the atmosphere formed by the breathing of that πνεῦμα.* "So long as they [the disobedient] allow this spirit to be their spirit, they live in the atmosphere thereof, and as it were inhale it—an atmosphere, which is the sphere of dominion [the ἐξουσία] of Satan." But apart from the clumsy and obscure accumulation of three genitives (at 2 Cor. iv. 4, 7, they flow easily and clearly one out of the other), there may be urged against this view generally the strange awkwardness of the thought ("the air of the spirit which worketh in the disobedient is the atmosphere formed by the breathing of the same spirit"), and more specially the considerations, first, that ἐξουσία does not mean *sphere* of dominion ;[1] secondly, that there is nothing to indicate that the ἀήρ originated through the *breathing* (or blowing) of the spirit (we should at least expect the essential πνέοντος instead of ἐνεργοῦντος); thirdly, that, if ἐξουσία is to denote the *sphere* of dominion, τῆς ἐξουσίας would be only an ambiguous pleonasm, and we cannot see why Paul should not have written merely τὸν ἄρχοντα τοῦ ἀέρος κ.τ.λ.—as regards the *historic basis* of the conception of the apostle, that the demons have their abode in the air, *he has carried it over from his pre-Christian, Jewish-Rabbinic circle of ideas into the contents of his Christian belief.* It is true that there are found among the Rabbins very diverse, confused, and at times very monstrous assertions concerning the dwelling-place of the demons,[2] but Harless[3] far too hastily thence concludes : "*in such sloughs as these one seeks in vain for the explanation of the apostle's expression.*" For while there are found diverse opinions in the Rabbins, and among them also that which assigns to the demons the air as a territory, the expression of the apostle shows us which of the different Rabbinic conceptions he has *not* followed, and *which* is accepted by him. Thus, indeed, *e.g.*, *the* doctrine which R. Bechai[4] presents as a *well-known* one, that only *those* demons which produce dreams dwell in the air, but those which seduce man to sin in the man himself, and yet others in the depths of the sea, is *not* the view of the apostle. But *the* belief, which Paul here announces as his own and presupposes in his readers, namely, that the demoniac kingdom in general, and not merely a single division of it, is in the air, is to be found very definitely preserved among the Rabbins also. For (1) the very Rabbinical tenet of the *winged* nature of the demons[5] manifestly points to the *region of the air* as their abode, since they are shut out from the communion of *God.* (2) In particular passages this is expressly stated. *Comment. in libr. Aboth.* f. 83. 2 : "Sciendum, a terra usque ad expansum omnia plena esse turmis et praefectis, et infra," "It must be known that from earth to the expanse all things are full of bands and prefects, and below" (that is precisely in the ἀήρ), "plurimas esse creaturas laedentes et accusantes, et omnes stare ac volitare in aëre," "there are very many creatures injuring and accusing, and that all stand and fly in the air," etc. Further, it is said in *Tuf Haarez*, f. 9, 2, that under the sphere of the moon, which is the last under all, is a firmament (רקיע) . . . and there are the souls of the devils, etc.[6] Further, R. Bechai says, *in Pentat.* f. 139, 4, where he is explaining how it comes about that the demons know what is future : "because they dwell in the air באויר), . . . they learn future things from the princes of the planets." The same R. Bechai, *in Pentat.* f. 18, 1, relates, as a Rabbinical tradition, that Noah had in his ark, according to Gen. vi. 19, preserved devils also, and says in confirmation of this exposition : for it would have been impossible for them to remain in their own place, which is the air (במקוטם שחהוא חאויר).[1] The assertion, too, of R. Menasseh, in Eisenmenger, II. p. 456 f., that the rising smoke of the incense which was offered to the devils was their food, points to the air as their dwelling-place; as, indeed, according to the Cabbala (*Cabb. denud.* I. p. 417), the demons dwell "below the upper sanctuary."[2] Thus much, consequently, is *clear and transparent* enough in the "*muddy sloughs*" of Rabbinical tradition, that the kingdom of the demons was located in the air; and with this we find the apostle in agreement. Hence we have no right to deny that he has retained this conception from the sphere of his Rabbinical training, but at the same time it would be quite unwarrantable to attribute to him the singularities associated with this tenet by the Rabbins, since, in fact, he asserts *nothing more* than that the devilish powers are *in the air*. This is a simple historical statement, in which, we may add, it is quite arbitrary to discern a "*profound* hint," namely, of their *dismal* and *spectral* nature (in opposition to Schenkel). The right explanation is given also by Schmid, *Bibl. Theol.* § 86, and Bleek. Among the Pythagoreans, too, we meet with an analogous view;[3] but quite unfounded is the assertion of Wetstein: "P. ita loquitur ex principiis philosophiae Pythagoreae, quibus illi, ad quos scribit, imbuti erant," "Paul thus speaks according to the principles of the Pythagorean philosophy, with which they to whom he writes were imbued." Paul presupposes in his readers an acquaintance with his expression as the expression of *his* doctrine, and speaks so emphatically and solemnly that any sort of accommodation is not to be thought of. [See Note XVII., p. 399.] — *τοῦ πνεύματος*] is still dependent on *τὸν ἄρχοντα*, so that the power over which the devil rules, after being designated as regards its outward existence by the phrase *ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος*, is now designated as regards its active operation in men's hearts, namely, as *the spirit which is at work in the disobedient.* This *πνεῦμα*, of which Satan is the ruler, is not, however, to be thought of as being the *human mind*, since, thus understood, it would not suit as apposition to the *τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος*, which is different from the human individuality, as, indeed, *τοῦ ἐνεργ. κ.τ.λ.* points to an agent different from the human individual; but rather as the principle proceeding from its *ἄρχων*, the devil, and passing over into men to become operative in their hearts—*the antithesis of the Holy Spirit which proceeds from God.* Comp. on 1 Cor. ii. 12. This *πνεῦμα* is, in contrast to *τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας*, the *πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης*, 1 John iv. 6. It is not, however, "odd,"[4] nor is it "unnatural,"[5] to speak of a "*ruler of this*

---

[1] See Matthiae, p. 991.

[2] So also Harless ; comp. H. Stephanus : "secundum eam, quae in hoc mundo est, vivendi rationem," "according to that mode of life which is in this world," Castalio, Beza, Grotius, *et al.*

[3] See Duncan, ed Rost, p. 47 ; Blomf. *ad Aesch. Prom.* 887 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 50.

[4] Comp. Estius and Flatt.

[5] Comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 469 ; Bernhardy, p. 47.

[6] See Duncan, *Lex. Hom.*, ed. Rost, p. 36.

---

[1] Oecumenius, comp. Theophylact.

[2] Chrysostom.

[3] Clericus, Heinsius, Michaelis, Storr, Flatt, Matthies, and others.

[4] Comp. Buttmann, *Lexilog.* I. p. 115.

[5] Thomas, Bullinger, and others.

[6] *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 328 f.

[7] He holds that Paul has perhaps employed the expression for the purpose of characterizing the demons as not indeed earthly, but yet also as not heavenly. He has employed the expression, just because he conceived of the demons as making their abode in the atmosphere. And he does not choose a higher expression (as in vi. 12) for this sphere, because he wishes here to make the reader feel the *lower* domain of the power as *opposed* to the heavenly domain, and thus also the *ignominious* character of the same; hence the expression is neither accidental nor strange (in opposition to Hofmann).

[8] *Erläut.* p. 175.

[9] *Schriftb.* I. p. 457.

---

[1] Not even in Luke xxiii. 7, where it expresses the idea of governing authority, of *jurisdiction.* So often in Plutarch, Diodorus, etc.

[2] See, especially, Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenth.* II. p. 437 ff.

[3] Followed by Olshausen.

[4] *in Pentat.* f. 90, 1.

[5] Talmud, *Chagig.* 2 ; R. Eliezer in Bartolocc. I. p. 320 ff., *al.*

[6] See Eisenmenger, II. p. 411.

---

[1] Comp. *Nishmath chasim*, f. 115, 2.

[2] With this Rabbinical view agrees also *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 729: ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀερίου πνεύματος τοῦ Βελιάρ, where ἀέριον means *to be found in the air*. See Plat. *Epin.* p. 948 D: δαίμονας, ἀέριον δὲ γένος. Comp. *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 547. If we take ἀέριος in such passages as aeriform (Hahn), we confound it with ἀέρινος (Arist. *de Anim.* iii. 13; *Metaph.* ix. 7). Comp. rather, *Ascens. Isa.* 10: "descendit in firmamentum, ubi princeps hujus mundi habitabat," "He descended into the firmament where the Prince of this world dwelt."

[3] Diog. Laert. viii. 32: κατὰ τὸν μὲν Πυθάγοραν εἶναί τε πάντα τὸν ἀέρα ψυχῶν ἔμπλεον, καὶ τούτους δαίμονάς τε καὶ ἥρωας νομίζεσθαι, "According to Pythagoras, all the air is full of spirits, and these are considered demons and heroes," and compare the other passages in Wetstein, and Elsner, p. 206; Dougt. *Anal.* p. 127.

[4] de Wette.

[5] Bleek.

spirit ;" but this is quite analogous to *the* conception, according to which Christ is spoken of as "*Lord of the Holy Spirit*" (2 Cor. iii. 18). We have further not to understand τοῦ πνεύματος *collectively ;*[1] for the ἐξουσία τοῦ ἀέρος is, indeed, the sum total of the plurality of the demons, but the *spirit*, which is brought by its ruler, the devil, into the hearts of men and operates within them, is in all υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθ. one and the self-same spirit, just as the Holy Spirit is in all individuals who believe one and the same. Others regard τοῦ πνεύματος as *apposition to* τὸν ἀρχ. τ. ἐξουσ. τ. ἀέρ., in that they either assume the use of an abnormal case occasioned by a deviation from the construction (genitive for accusative), as Piscator, Calovius, Semler, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Rückert, de Wette, Bleek, or look upon the genitive as one of *apposition* to τὸν ἄρχοντα, as Flatt. But how purely arbitrary is the former ! and how impossible the latter, since τὸν ἄρχοντα, in accordance with its significance, *demands* a *defining* genitive, and already *has* it in τῆς ἐξουσ. τ. ἀέρ., and consequently τοῦ πνεύματος *cannot* be taken in any other relation !—νῦν] is emphatic,—not, however, as Meier supposes:[2] "*even now*, when it is so powerfully counteracted by the gospel," which must have been expressed by καὶ νῦν;[3] but νῦν stands opposed to the preceding ποτέ, when the diabolic πνεῦμα was active in *all*, even in the readers. Comp. ver. 3. Rückert[4] thinks of the *extraordinary*, *especially dangerous* power which the Satanic kingdom developed just at the time of the redemption (2 Thess. ii. 2 ff.); so also de Wette. But that could not be understood from the simple ἐνεργ., and would have required the addition of a περισσοτέρως, ὑπερβαλλόντως, "extraordinarily, exceedingly," or the like. According to Olshausen, νῦν is to be held as opposed to the *future* age, and to make the diabolic activity appear as *limited*, in contrast to the everlasting, divine activity of the Holy Spirit. But a contrast to the αἰὼν μέλλων is not at all implied in the context ; indeed, it was entirely self-evident that the Satanic activity extends only to the time before the Parousia ; how then could it occur to a reader to find in the νῦν a negation of the αἰὼν μέλλων ? —ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθ.] in their souls. The expression υἱοὶ τ. ἀπειθ. is Hebraizing,[5] and denotes the dependence which has its basis in the relation of the person or thing concerned to the genitive-noun, here *the genesis of the spiritual condition*, so that τοῖς ἐξ ἀπειθείας (comp. Rom. ii. 8) would signify the same thing. Comp. Winer, p. 213. The opposite is τέκνα ὑπακοῆς, 1 Pet. i. 14. By ἀπείθεια, however, is not meant *unbelief;*[6] for this could only be logically included under the notion of disobedience as *refusal* of belief, consequently as opposite to the ὑπακοὴ πίστεως (Rom. i. 5 ; Heb. iv. 6, 11 ; and see Fritzsche on Rom. xi. 30). And with *that* sense in the present case the following ἐν αἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες would be at variance, since not *all* Jewish-Christians had, like Paul, *resisted* the faith. Now, as Paul is speaking only of the *immorality* of the unbelievers (vv. 1, 3), *ἀπείθεια* is here the want of compliance towards God (Rom. xi. 30), *i.e.*, towards His revealed and natural law respectively (Rom. ii. 8 ff.), displaying itself through their *immoral conduct.*

---

[1] Vatablus, Grotius, Estius, Wolf, Michaelis, Holzhausen.

[2] Comp. Zanchius.

[3] As Ignat. *ad Smyrn. interp.* 7.

[4] Comp. Bengel and Holzhausen.

[5] For among Greek writers are found only such expressions as υἷες Ἀχαιῶν, παῖδες ζωγράφων, "sons of Achaeans, children of painters," and the like, but not with abstract nouns ; see Blomfield, *Gloss. Pers.* 408, p. 138 ; Stallb. *ad Plat. Phil.* p. 107.

[6] Luther, Bengel, Koppe, Harless, and others.

Ver. 3. After the apostle has just depicted the pre-Christian corruption of the *readers*, who were *Gentile-Christians*, the sinful corruptness of *all*—this basis for his enthusiastic certainty of the universality of the redemption (Rom. i. 18 . . . ii. 24, iii. 19, 23, xi. 32 ; Gal. ii. 15, 16, iii. 22, *al.*)—presents itself at the same time with such vividness before his mind, that he now also includes with the others *the whole body of the Jewish-Christians* (*καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες*) in the same state of corruption, and *accordingly*, on the resumption of the argument at ver. 4, he cannot again employ the second person introduced in ver. 1, but must change this into *ἡμᾶς*. Inasmuch as *καὶ ἡμεῖς*, *we also*, must necessarily denote the class *falling to be added* to *ὑμᾶς*, ver. 1, we cannot understand by it the *Christians generally*;[1] but, since the *ὑμεῖς* are Gentile-Christians, we must take it to mean the *Jewish-Christians*. The *general* moral description which follows is not opposed to this view,[2] since it was the very object of the apostle to delineate the essential *equality* in the moral condition of both.[3] Comp. Rom. i. 2, 3. De Wette explains it quite arbitrarily : "we also, *who have been already a considerable time Christians.*" — *ἐν οἷς*] is not to be referred to *τοῖς παραπτώματι*, ver. 1,[4] for that reference is not to be supported by Col. iii. 7, but, on the contrary, is impossible with the reading *ὑμῶν* after *ἁμαρτ.*, ver. 1, and is, moreover, to be rejected, because Paul has not again written *ἐν αἷς*, and because reference to the *nearest* subject is altogether suitable ; for the Jewish-Christians also all walked once *among the disobedient*, as belonging to the ethical category of the same, inasmuch as they likewise before their conversion were through their immoral walk disobedient towards God (Rom. ii. 17 ff., 25, iii. 9 ff.). — *ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμ. τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμ.*] more precise definition to what has just been said *ἐν οἷς . . . ἀνεστράφημεν ποτέ*, denoting the immoral domain of the pre-Christian state,[5] in which this walk took place, namely, in the desires of our corporeo-psychical human nature, whose impulses, adverse to God, had not yet experienced the overcoming influence of the Holy Spirit (Rom. vii. 14 ff., viii. 7 ; Gal. v. 17 ; Rom. viii. 2, *al.*), and hence rendered ineffectual the moral volition directed towards the divine law (Rom. vii. 17–20). The opposite is : *πνεύματι περιπατεῖν* (*καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς μὴ τελεῖν*), Gal. v. 16 ; comp. Rom. viii. 13. — *ποιοῦντες κ.τ.λ.*] *so that we*, etc., now specifies the *way and manner* of this walk, wherein the prefixed *ποιοῦντες* has the emphasis, in that it predicates what they *did*, as afterwards *ἦμεν*, what they *were.* The *θελήματα* (comp. on the plural, Acts xiii. 22 ; Jer. xxiii. 26 ; 2 Macc. i. 3) are here in reality not different from the ἐπιθυμίαι, which, however, are conceived of as *activities of the will*, that take place on the part of the σάρξ and the διάνοιαι (both conceived of under a personified aspect as the power ruling the *ego* of the unconverted man). As regards τῶν διανοιῶν, which stands related to τῆς σαρκός as the special to the general, the bad connotation is not implied in the *plural*, as Harless conjectures (who finds therein "fluctuating, changing opinions"), but in the *context*, which makes us think of the *unholy* thoughts,[1] whose volitions were directed to evil, in the state of disobedience. Comp. Num. xv. 39 : μνησθήσεσθε πασῶν τῶν ἐντολῶν κυρίου καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτάς. καὶ οὐ διαστραφήσεσθε ὀπίσω τῶν διανοιῶν ὑμῶν, "Remember all the commandments of the Lord and do them ; and that ye seek not ;" also Jer. xxiii. 26; Isa. lv. 9 (τὰ διανοήματα), where likewise the prejudicial connotation lies not in the plural, but in the *connection.* — καὶ ἤμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς] Instead of continuing the construction in uniformity with ποιοῦντες by καὶ ὄντες, the apostle passes over, as at i. 20 (see on that passage), emphatically into the *oratio finita*, depicting, after the immoral mode of action, the *unhappy condition* in which withal we found ourselves. The fact that on *this* account ἤμεν is *prefixed* has been left unnoticed, and hence καὶ ἤμεν has been either tacitly (so usually) or expressly [2] connected with ἐν οἷς . . . ἀνεστρ. Harless [also Hofm. Braune, Ewald] regards the words as only a supplemental and more exact definition and modification of the thought expressed immediately before ; but in that case an isolation of the words is needlessly assumed, and likewise the correlation of the prefixed verbs ποιοῦντες and ἤμεν is overlooked. — τέκνα ὀργῆς are *children of wrath* (comp. on ver. 2), that is, however, not merely *those worthy of wrath*,[3] which relation of dependence is not in keeping with the context, but, as νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτ. shows, ver. 1, *subject to wrath, irae obnoxii, standing under wrath* (comp. v. 8 ; Matt. xxiii. 15 ; John xvii. 12). So most expositors rightly take it. To *whose* wrath they were subject, Paul does not indicate (for he does not write τῆς ὀργῆς, comp. Rom. xii. 19), but (comp. Rom. iv. 15) he leaves it to the reader to say for himself that it is *God's* wrath he has to think of (see ver. 4). As to the *wrath* of God,—which here, too, is not to be understood merely of that of the future judgment,[4]—the holy emotion of absolute displeasure at evil, which is necessarily posited by absolute love to the good, and is thus the necessary principle of temporal and eternal punishment on the part of God (not the punishment itself), comp. on Rom. i. 18. — φύσει] dative of the more precise mode (=κατὰ φύσιν), may either attach itself merely to τέκνα (not to ἤμεν), so that the idea expressed is : *nature-children*, τέκνα φυσικὰ ὀργῆς ;[5] or it may more precisely define the *whole notion* τέκνα ὀργῆς, thus : *wrath-children by nature*, τέκνα ὀργῆς φυσικά ; so that the τέκνα ὀργ., like υἱοὶ τ. ἀπειθείας, ver. 2, forms a single idea. The latter is the correct view, because τέκνα is used figuratively and receives the real contents of the conception only by means of ὀργῆς, for which reason it is not to be thought of as separated therefrom.[1] The notion of φύσει must obtain its more precise definition solely from the context, as to whether, namely, it betoken an *innate* relation,[2]—whether it be consequently equivalent to γενέσει, and the sonship of wrath be ἔμφυτος, a *qualitas innata*, "implanted an innate quality,"[3]— or, on the other hand, a relation *brought about* by development of a *nativa indoles*, "native disposition," one that has *been produced by virtue of natural endowment*.[4] In the latter sense David is said by Josephus, *Antt.* vii 7. 1, to have been φύσει δίκαιος καὶ θεοσεβής, "by nature just and religious;" comp. xiii. 10. 6. Philo, *de conf. lingu.* p. 327 E : ἀντιλογικοὶ φύσει, "by nature contradictory," Xen. *Oec.* xx. 25 : φύσει φιλογεωργότατος, "by nature most fond of country life," Plut. *Artax.* 6 : φύσει βαρύθυμος οὖσα, "by nature being sullen," Arist. *Polit.* i. 1. 9 : ἄνθρωπος φύσει πολιτικὸν ζῶον, "man by nature a political animal," and many others. According to this view, ἦμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς would have to be paraphrased by: ἦμεν, τῇ φύσει χρησάμενοι, τέκνα ὀργῆς. From early times[5] the word in our passage has been employed in defence of *original sin* as an *inborn* condition of culpability (*inborn peccatum vere damnans*, "sin truly condemning"), as indeed even Rückert, Harless, Olshausen, Usteri,[6] Julius Müller, Lechler, Philippi, Thomasius, and others have understood an *inborn* childship of wrath. "Paulus nos *cum peccato gigni* testatur, quemadmodum serpentes suum venenum ex utero afferunt," "Paul testifies that we are born with sin, as serpents bring from the womb their poison," Calvin. "Hoc uno verbo, quasi fulmine, totus homo, quantus est, prosternitur ; neque enim naturam dicit laesam, sed mortuam per peccatum ideoque irae obnoxiam," "By this one word, as by a thunderbolt, the entire man, however great he is, is prostrated ; for he does not say that nature is injured, but is dead by sin, and therefore subject to wrath," Beza.[7] But (1) the context points, in vv. 1–3, as again also in ver. 5, to an *actually produced*, not to an *inborn* state of guilt.[1] Further, (2) if Paul had wished, after touching on the sinful *action*, to bring into prominence the *inborn* state of culpability, and so had taken the course *ab effectu ad causam*, "from the effect to the cause," φύσει would have an emphasis, which would make its critically assured position, as it stands in the *Recepta*, appear simply inappropriate ; in fact, not even the position in Lachmann (ἤμεν φύσει τέκνα ὀργῆς) would be sufficiently in keeping, but we should be obliged logically to expect : καὶ φύσει ἤμεν τέκνα ὀργῆς, "and (already) by birth were we children of wrath," in which would lie the source of sinful action. But (3) the *ecclesiastical* dogma, that man is a *born* subject of wrath, *from birth* an object of the divine condemnation, is not at all a doctrine of the apostle, according to whom man by his *actual* sin falls under the wrath of God (Rom. i. 18, ii. 8, 9, vii. 7 f., *al.*), inasmuch, namely, as he becomes subject to and follows the inborn *principle* of sin (Rom. vii. 14 ff.), in opposition to his moral will, which he likewise by nature bears in himself ; in connection with which, we may add, bodily *death* has its *causal* basis not in the individual sin of the particular persons, but in the connection of the whole race with the fall and death-penalty of its first progenitor (see on Rom. v. 12). And (4) how could Paul, speaking of the *Jews*, predicate of them an *inborn* childship of wrath, when he regarded them as κλάδους ἁγίους τῆς ῥίζης ἁγίας (Rom. xi. 16) ! They were in fact οἱ κατὰ φύσιν κλάδοι of the sacred olive-tree of the theocracy (Rom. xi. 21) ; how could they be at the same time the opposite (observe the κατὰ φύσιν), *born* τέκνα ὀργῆς ? See also Gal. ii. 15, where the φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι are *opposed* to the ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἁμαρτωλοί,[2] as well as Rom. ix. 4, where of them is predicated the possession of the υἱοθεσία, consequently the type of the Christian childship of God, whereof the inborn childship of wrath would be the direct opposite.[3] Several have found in φύσει the sense : "apart from the special relation in which they as Israelites stood to God ;"[4] but this is just a mere saving clause obtruded on the text, in connection with which there is nevertheless retained the un-Pauline conception of *born* liability to wrath, consequently of condemnation *from the very first*, without any personal participation and contracting of guilt, before one yet *knows* sin (Rom. vii. 7).[5] Further, (5) if Paul had thought of an *inborn* liability to wrath, he could not have regarded even the *children of Christians* as *holy* and *pure* (1 Cor. vii. 14) ; and infant baptism must have been already ordained in the N. T., and that, indeed, with the absolute *necessity*, which had to be subsequently assigned to

---

[1] Estius, Koppe, and others.

[2] As de Wette objects.

[3] In doing which Paul could, least of all, venture to except himself, although, according to Phil. iii. 6, the *justitia externa*, "outward righteousness," had not been wanting to him.

[4] Peshito, Jerome, Grotius, Estius, Bengel, Baumgarten, Koppe, Rosenmüller.

[5] 2 Cor. i. 12 ; 2 Pet. ii. 18 ; comp. Xen. *Ages.* ix. 4 ; Plat. *Legg.* ix. p. 865 E ; Polyb. ix. 21. 5.

---

[1] That these were *selfish*, is in itself correct, but is not implied in the word itself, and is not expressed by Paul (in opposition to Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 563).

[2] As by Fritzsche, *Conject.* p. 45, who takes ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμ. τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν ποιοῦντες κ.τ.λ. together as one clause.

[3] Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Castalio, Calvin, Grotius, and others.

[4] Ritschl, *de ira Dei*, p. 17.

[5] See on such datives joined on to nouns. Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 688 ; Heind. *ad Cratyl*, p. 131.

---

[1] According to this view, there is here in the position of the words a *severance* (Kühner, II. p. 627) whereby the genitive is separated from its governing word (Buttm. *neut. Gr.* p. 332 [E. T. 387]). This hyperbaton has for its object the reserving of the whole emphasis for the closing word ὀργῆς, and letting it fall thereon. Comp. Philem. *fragm.* p. 354, ed. Cleric.: πολλῶν φύσει τοῖς πᾶσιν αἰτία κακῶν, "by nature, the cause of many evils to all."

[2] As in Gal. ii. 15 ; Xen. *Mem.* i. 4. 14 ; Dem. 1411 ult.; Soph. *Aj.* 1280 ; *O. C.* 1297 ; Isoc. *Evag.* 16 : τῷ μὲν γὰρ ἦν φύσει πατρίς, τὸν δὲ . . . νόμῳ πολίτην ἐπεποίηντο ; specially instructive are Plat. *Prot.* p. 323 C D, Dem. 774, 7.

[3] Wisd. xii. 10, comp. xiii. 1, and thereon Grimm, *Handb.* p. 233.

[4] As Rom. ii. 14 ; 1 Cor. xi. 14 ; Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 14, iv. 1. 3 ; Plat. *Legg.* vi. p. 777 D ; Ael. *V.H.* ii. 13. 3, xxii. 9. 1 ; see also Wetstein *in loc.*, and Loesner, p. 340 f.

[5] See, already, Augustine, *Retract.* i. 10. 15 ; *de verb. ap.* 14.

[6] Usteri, *Lehrbegr.* p. 30, we may add, suspects the genuineness of φύσει, partly on account of its alleged singular position, partly on account of the various readings. But as regards the position, see above. And of various readings there are none at all, since different translations are not various readings. φύσει is omitted only in 109, Aeth. No doubt Clem. Alex. *ad Gent.* (*Opp.* ed. Pott, p. 23) is also adduced, where the passage is cited without φύσει. But in Clem. *l.c.* (comp. p. 560) we have no citation, but merely a free *use* of the passage, from which the existence of variations cannot be made good. Clement, we may add, singularly explains τέκνα ὀργῆς by τρεφόμενα ὀργῇ, ὀργῆς θρέμματα.

[7] Comp. *Form. Conc.* p. 639 f.

---

[1] Quite mistakenly Grotius argues from the context against the ecclesiastical exposition in this way : "Non agi hic de labe originaria, satis ostendunt praecedentia, *ubi describuntur vitia, a quibus multi veteram fuere immunes*," "That here the original fall is not treated of, is sufficiently shown by what precedes, where vices are described from which many of the ancients were free." See, on the other hand, Rom. i.-iii., xi. 32 ; Gal. iii. 22, *al.*

[2] Which Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 564 (comp. his *Heil. Schr. N. T.* II. 1, p. 24), denies on invalid linguistic grounds ; see on Gal. *l.c.*

[3] See, generally, on the sanctity of the people of God, Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 262 ff.

[4] Thomasius, I. p. 289.

[5] This remark also holds in opposition to the essentially similar interpretation in Hofmann, p. 565, comp. Schmid, *bibl. Theol.* II. p. 274, and Julius Müller, *v. d. Sünde*, p. 377 f.

it in consistency with the elaboration of the dogma of original sin bringing eternal condemnation on every one born by ordinary generation. The explanation of an *inborn* state of wrath (which also does not tally with the fact that Jesus promises the kingdom of heaven to those who should be like children, Matt. xviii. 2 f., xix. 14 f.) is accordingly to be rejected as *opposed to the context* and *un-Pauline;* and φύσει defines the childship of wrath to the effect, that it has arisen *in virtue of natural constitution* (observe the just-mentioned ἐπιθυμίαι τῆς σαρκός, comp. the νόμος ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι, which overcomes the moral law in man, Rom. vii. 23, 24). [See Note XVIII., p. 399.] Certainly man is *born* with this natural, sinful quality, *i.e.*, with the principle of sin, by the awakening and development of which the moral will is vanquished (Rom. vii. ; comp. also John iii. 6) ; it is not, however, the mere fact of this inborn presence having its basis in his σάρξ, that *in and of itself*[1] makes him the child of wrath,[2] but he only becomes so, when that constitution of his moral nature, that mingling of two opposite principles in his natural disposition, has—which, however, is the case with *every one* (Rom. iii. 9, xi. 32 ; Gal. iii. 22)—brought about the victory of the sin-principle, and therewith the σαρκικόν and πεπραμένον ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν εἶναι (Rom. vii. 14).[3] Others, such as Erasmus, Balduin, Bengel, Morus, Koppe, Stolz, Flatt, Matthies, de Wette, Bleek,[4] have explained it of the so-called *natural state* of man, *i.e.*, of the state of the pre-Christian life, which was as yet aloof from the influence of χάρις (ver. 5 ff.) and of the Holy Spirit ; but in this way, properly speaking, *nothing* is explained ; for while the whole description, and not merely φύσει, delineates "the natural state in which the redemptive activity of God found the nations,"[5] in connection with φύσει there always remains the special question, whether the "*by nature*" denotes an inborn relation to wrath or not. Holzhausen would even combine φύσει ὀργῆς ("wrath which comes from the ungodly nature-life"),—a view from which, even if φύσις meant nature-life, the very absence of any article ought in itself to have precluded him ; τῆς τῇ φύσει ὀργῆς, or τῆς ἐκ τῆς φύσ. ὀργῆς, or the like, must have been used.

---

[1] The objection of Lechler, p. 107 (comp. Philippi, *Dogm.* III. p. 205 f.)—that my explanation, inasmuch as the sinful disposition is *inborn*, thereby after all concedes the traditional Church-view—overlooks the essential distinction, that it is only according to the latter that man is *born* as object of the divine wrath ; whereas, according to my view, the natural disposition to sin does not yet in and by itself make him such an object of wrath, but he *becomes* so only through the setting in of *actual* sin, which, it is true, does not fail to emerge in any one who lives long enough to be *able* to sin. According to the traditional view, even the newly-born unconscious child is already guilty and liable to the Divine wrath ; so that in this way the imputation attaches itself not merely to the *perpetration* of sin, but even to the *occasion to sin*, which every one has by nature. This is, so far as I can see, *exegetically incompatible* with the anthropological teachings of the apostle elsewhere, especially with his exposition in Rom. vii. 7 f. Only with the *actual* sin, according to Paul, is the *guilt* connected, and consequently the wrath of God. An *inborn* guilt is not taught by the apostle; as is rightly brought out by Ernesti, but is only hesitatingly hinted at by Bleek.

[2] Comp. Beyschlag, *Christol. d. N. T.* p. 207.

[3] Through Christian regeneration the moral will attains, by virtue of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 2), the ascendancy in man, and he becomes therewithal qualitatively θείας κοινωνὸς φύσεως, 2 Pet. i. 4, and μεταλαμβάνων τὴς ἁγιώτητος τοῦ Θεοῦ, Heb. xii. 10. Comp. 1 John v. 18.

[4] Comp. also Weber, *vom Zorn Gottes*, p. 88.

[5] de Wette.

Moreover, Cyril, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Grotius, erroneously hold φύσει as equivalent to ἀληθῶς (comp. others in Jerome, who take it as *prorsus*), which it never is, not even in Gal. iv. 8, to which Grotius appeals. Lastly, in a quite peculiar way Ernesti[1] obtains the exact opposite of a born liability to wrath by conducting his interpretation so as to enclose τέκνα φύσει within two commas, and to connect ὀργῆς with ἦμεν : "*We were* in consequence of our actual sinfulness, *although children* [of God in the Israelitish sense, Rom. ix. 4] *by nature, liable to wrath even as the Gentiles ;*" according to which, therefore, ἦμεν ὀργῆς is explained from the well-known usage of εἶναί τινος in the sense of "belonging to." But it may be decisively urged against this view, first, that the supplying the thought of Θεοῦ after τέκνα (as Isa. lxiii. 8 ; Rom. viii. 17 ; Gal. iv. 6) is not in any way suggested by the context, but is purely arbitrary, and the more so, inasmuch as there is already in the text a genitive which offers itself to complete the notion of τέκνα ; and secondly, that there is nothing to indicate the contrast assumed by Ernesti (*although*, etc.), for in order to write in some measure intelligibly, Paul must at least have said : καὶ ἦμεν τέκνα μὲν φύσει, ὀργῆς δέ, although this, too, on account of the absence of a definition to τέκνα, would have been enigmatic enough. Equally to be rejected is the quite similar interpretation of Nickel,[2] who explains as though the words ran : καὶ ἦμεν Θεοῦ μὲν τέκνα φύσει, ὀργῆς δὲ τέκνα, "We were, on the one hand, by nature God's children ; on the other, children of wrath."—ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποί] *sc.* ἦσαν. The λοιποί are the *Gentiles* (Rom. iii. 9 ; 1 Thess. iv. 13), and καί is not *adhuc* (Grotius), but the *also* of comparison.

Ver. 4. Now begins, after the intervening clauses, vv. 2, 3, the resumption, and that with the *subject*, which Paul already had in mind at ver. 1. See on ver. 1. It is not, however, by οὖν, but by δέ, that the thought is taken up again, because that which is now to be spoken of (the abundant compassion of God) stands in an *adversative* relation to what has been said in the relative clauses.[3] — πλούσιος ὢν ἐν ἐλέει κ.τ.λ.] The connection is : *God, however, since He is rich in mercy, has for His much love's sake made . . . us . . . alive in Christ.* As to the distinction between ἔλεος and οἰκτιρμός, see on Rom. ix. 15. On ἐν ἐλέει, comp. 1 Cor. i. 5 ; Jas. ii. 5 ; 2 Cor. ix. 11 ; 1 Tim. vi. 18. — διὰ τὴν πολλ. ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ] namely, *in order to satisfy it.*[4] Luther erroneously renders : *through* His great love. The Vulgate, rightly: *propter*, etc. Comp. Philem. 8. We may add that not αὑτοῦ is to be written, but αὐτοῦ, as at i. 6. — ἣν ἠγάπ. ἡμ] as in John xvii. 26. Comp. the classical ἔρωτα ἐρᾶν, Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 516. The *manifestation* of the divine love thereby meant is the atoning death of Christ, in which, in pursuance of the abundance of the divine compassion, the great love of God communicated itself to us. Rom. v. 18 ; John iii. 16 ; Eph. v. 2, 25. — ἡμᾶς] After the glance has extended from the readers (vv. 1, 2) also to the Jewish

---

[1] *Urspr. d. Sünde*, II. p. 174 ff.

[2] In Reuter's *Repert.* 1860, Oct., p. 16.

[3] See Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 377. [Cf. Winer, § 53, 7.]

[4] The great love of God, who is rich in mercy toward the wretched, was the motive for not leaving them to their misery, but, etc. The ἔλεος is thus related to the ἀγάπη as the *species* to the *genus*.

Christians (ver. 3), the resumption of the object with ἡμᾶς now embraces *both*, the Jewish *and* Gentile Christians.

Ver. 5. The καί is not to be taken as in ver. 1 ("also us collectively," Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, and earlier expositors), which, apart from the universal reference of the ἡμᾶς, the order of the words forbids (καὶ ἡμᾶς must have been written), according to which, also, the καί of ver. 1 can by no means be here resumed ;[1] further, καί is not, with Koppe, to be taken as *although*, seeing that, in fact, a making alive *cannot* take place otherwise than from a state of death, and consequently καί cannot convey any climactic stress, on which account Harless explains incorrectly from a logical point of view : "even in the state of death, in which we were."[2] Erasmus paraphrases as though καί stood before συνεζωοπ., and even the expedient to which Morus has recourse, that καί corresponds to the καί of ver. 6 (*non modo*, "not only," . . . *verum etiam*, "but also"), would demand this position. Others give other explanations, and many are silent with regard to it. If καί were *also*, it would have to be referred to ὄντας,[3] and would express the *reality* of the relation asserted in ver. 1.[4] But there would be nothing to call for the assurance of this reality. It is rather the simple copula : *and*, annexing to the διὰ τ. πολλ. ἀγ. ἣν ἠγ. ἡμ. a further element.[5] The two elements, side by side, place in the full light what God has done. God has, on account of His much love, *and when we were dead in the sins*, made us alive with Christ. The καί might also be omitted, but the keeping of the points thus apart *strengthens* the representation. — τοῖς παραπτ.] The article denotes the sins, *which we had committed*, with a retrospective glance at ver. 1. — συνεζωοποίησε τῷ Χρ.] is by most expositors[6] understood of new *spiritual* quickening.[7] But how is this to be justified from the context ? If the reader was reminded by νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτ. of the *eternal* death, to which he had been subjected by his pre-Christian life of sin (see on ver. 1), he would now have to think of the *eternal* life, which begins with the resurrection, and he could the less think of anything else than of this real resurrection-life, since afterwards there is further expressed the translation together into heaven, and then, in ver. 7, the intention of God is referred to the times *after the Parousia*. And had not already i. 18 f. pointed definitely to the *future* κληρονομία ? How, in *this* connection, could a reader light upon the merely ethical, spiritual quickening (Rom. vi. 4 f. ; 2 Cor. v. 15 ; Gal. ii. 19 f.) ? No, God has *made* believers *alive with Christ ; i.e.*, in Christ's revivification, which God has wrought, theirs also is included. By virtue of the dynamic connection in which Christ stands with His believers, as the head with its body (i. 23), their revivification is objectively comprehended in His,—a relation, in fact, of which the Christian is conscious in faith ; "quum autem *fides* suscipitur, ea omnia a Deo applicantur homini, et ab homine rata habentur," "But when faith is received, all those things are applied to man by God and are considered as ratified by man," Bengel. So the matter stands in the view of the apostle as *accomplished,* because the making alive of Christ is *accomplished ;* the future actual making alive, or, as the case may be, change *at the Parousia* (1 Cor. xv. 23), is then the subjective individual participation of that which is already objectively given on the part of God in the resurrection of Christ. Certainly Paul might, in accordance with another mode of looking at it, have expressed himself by the *future,* as at 1 Cor. xv. 22 ; cf. Rom. viii. 17 ; but who does not feel that by means of the *aorist*[1] the matter stands forth more forcibly and triumphantly out of the believing conviction of the apostle ? *οὓς ἐδικαίωσε τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασε,* Rom. viii. 30. — The *σύν* in *συνεζωοπ.* is by Beza erroneously referred to the *coagmentatio gentium et Judaeorum,* "union of Gentiles and Jews," a reference which is forbidden by the *τῷ Χριστῷ* ; and by Grotius, Koppe, Rosenmüller, and others, it is explained *ad exemplum,* "according to the example,"[2] by which the Pauline idea of *fellowship* with Christ, which also lay at the bottom of i. 19, is quite arbitrarily explained away. — Comp. on Col. ii. 13 ; Rom. viii. 17 ; 2 Tim. ii. 12. — *χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμ.*] *by grace* (not by merit) *are ye partakers of the Messianic salvation!* an impassioned (hence expressed in the second person), parenthetic reminding the readers of the *divine basis* of the salvation which had accrued to them, designated by *συνεζωοποίησε* ; a reminding, which was very natural for the apostle in general (for its tenor was the sum of his doctrine and the constant echo of his own experience, 1 Cor. xv. 10), and more especially here, where he represents the quickening of believers as accomplished with the making alive of Christ, which could not but repel even the most distant thought of personal merit. In connection with *συνεζωοπ. τ. Χρ.* the possession of the Messianic bliss is designated as an already accomplished fact, although it was before the Parousia (Col. iii. 3 f.) merely a possession in hope (Rom. viii. 24), and the final realization was yet future (Rom. v. 10). That the *χάριτι* emphatically placed at the beginning[3] means the grace of *God,* not of *Christ,*[4] is manifest from the context, in which God is constantly the *subject.*

---

[1] Rückert, Matthies, Holzhausen, and most of the older expositors.

[2] Comp. Calvin and de Wette.

[3] For, as to the fact that καί, *also*, always lays the stress upon *that* word, before which it stands, see Haupt, *Obss. Crit.* p. 55 ff. Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 638.

[4] Hartung, I. p. 132 f.

[5] Bleek describes this view of mine as probably the correct one, and follows it.

[6] Including Flatt, Rückert, Meier, Matthies, Harless, Olshausen, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel, Hofmann, Bleek.

[7] "*Justificationem* et *regenerationem* nostram complectitur," "It embraces our justification and regeneration," Boyd ; Rückert would have us think mainly of the *justification*.

Ver. 6. After the making alive of Christ in the grave followed His *resurrection,* with which Paul regards that of believers as likewise accomplished. Hence : *καὶ συνήγειρε,* which in like manner is not to be taken in the *spiritual sense ;*[5] but see on ver. 5. With strange inconsistency several expositors, such as Menochius, Zanchius, Boyd, Estius, Grotius, although taking συνεζωοπ. metaphorically, nevertheless have taken this συνήγειρε (as well as the element that follows) *in a literal sense*, and mentally supplied *nempe spe*, "namely, by hope," or the like. — καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρ.] *and hath given to us joint-seat in the heavenly regions* (comp. i. 20), so that we have part (see on 1 Cor. vi. 2) in the *dominion* of the Exalted One (2 Tim. ii. 12); which Paul likewise sees as already *accomplished*[1] with the installing of Christ at the right hand of God; hence, there was no need at all for supplying the thought *jure et virtute spirituali*, "by spiritual right and virtue,"[2] or for a transference of the matter to the *praescientia Dei*, "God's foreknowledge,"[3] and other such expedients. — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] belongs to συνήγειρε and συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουραν., so that what was expressed in the case of συνεζωοπ. by (συν) τῷ Χριστῷ, is here expressed, in yet more exact conception of the relation, by (συν) ἐν Χριστῷ (jointly *in Christ*). *Inasmuch, namely, as God raised and exalted Christ* (ἐν Χριστῷ), He has raised and exalted us with Him. ἐν Χριστῷ accordingly is by no means intended to denote the συγκαθίζειν as figurative.[4] — On ἐν τοῖς ἐπουραν. (see on i. 3) Bengel, we may add,[5] aptly remarks: "non dicit *in dextra;* Christo sua manet excellentia," "He does not say: 'at the right hand;' His own excellence remains to Christ." The *transitive* συγκαθίζειν is not elsewhere preserved.

---

[1] "Ponitur autem aoristus de re, quae, quamvis futura sit, tamen pro peracta recte censeatur, cum . . . alia re jam facta contineatur," "The aorist is used of a matter, which, although it be future, nevertheless is properly regarded as past, when it is contained in another matter already accomplished," Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 206.

[2] Comp. Anselm : *sicut,* "just as."

[3] For "*gratiam* esse docet proram et puppim," "He teaches that grace is both prow and stern," Bengel.

[4] Beza ; comp. the inserted οὗ in D* E F G, Vulg. It. Victorin. Aug. Ambrosiaster.

[5] "To make them enter upon the new life of grace," Rückert.

Ver. 7. Aim of God in connection with what is said, vv. 5, 6. — ἵνα ἐνδείξηται] prefixed with emphasis: *in order*—not to leave concealed and unknown, but—*to exhibit* and make manifest, etc. Comp. Rom. ix. 23. — ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσι τοῖς ἐπερχ.] *in the ages coming on*, *i.e.*, in the times after the Parousia, as being already *on the approach*.[6] In the times from the Parousia (conceived as near at hand) onward, the manifestation designed by God of His grace towards believers was to take place, because not before, but only *after the Parousia*, would the making alive of the believers, etc., implicitly contained in the making alive of Christ, be actually accomplished in the subjects. Incorrect, seeing that the apostle was previously speaking, not of the spiritual, but of the real resurrection, etc., is the rendering of Morus: "per omne vestrum tempus reliquum quum in hac vita tum in futura quoque," "through all your time left, not only in this life, but also in that which is to come," as well as that of Wolf:[1] "tempora inde ab apostolicis illis ad finem mundi secutura," "the times that were to follow from those of the apostles to the end of the world." Koppe brings out, "*ut aeternum duraturum argumentum extaret*," "that an argument might stand forth which would last eternally," which is quite mistaken, since, while it is true that the αἰῶνες οἱ ἐπερχόμενοι are eternal times, the words do not *signify* tempora aeternum futura, "times to be eternally." Respecting the *plural* τοῖς αἰῶσι, comp. on iii. 21. To infer from this that the setting in of the Messianic period will not be accomplished suddenly, but by way of successive development,[2] is at variance with the whole N. T. The future αἰών sets in through the Parousia very suddenly and in an instant, Matt. xxiv. 27; 1 Cor. xv. 52, *al.* Hence we have not mentally to supply with ἐνδείξ. anything like: "*ever more completely*,"[3] or "*ever more effectively*,"[4] which is sheer caprice. — The form τὸ πλοῦτος is here also decisively attested. See on i. 7. — ἐν χρηστότητι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] is to be taken *together*, and the instrumental ἐν indicates *by what* God will manifest the exceeding great riches of His grace in the ages to come, *by kindness towards us in Christ Jesus*, *i.e.*, by means of the fact that He shows Himself gracious towards us, of which the ground lies in Christ (not in us, see ver. 8). The article was not at all requisite before ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, since χρηστότητι is anarthrous, and besides χρηστότης ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, like χρηστὸν εἶναι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς (Luke vi. 35), can be closely joined together in thought. Comp. on i. 15. — The χάρις is the *source* of the χρηστότης, which latter displays itself in forgiving (comp. Prayer of Manass. 11; Tit. iii. 4; Rom. ii. 4) and in benefiting, and therefore is the *evidence* of the former, the opposite of ἀποτομία, Rom. xi. 22.[5]

---

[1] Explanations in the *spiritual* sense. Calixtus: "Ea nobis dedit dona, quae civibus coelorum propria sunt," "He hath given us those gifts which are peculiar to citizens of heaven." Rosenmüller: "Summa felicitate nos ornavit, quasi jam in coelo essemus recepti," "He hath furnished us with the highest happiness, as though we had been already received in heaven." Rückert and Bleek remind us of the πολίτευμα of Christians, which is in heaven (Phil. iii. 20; comp. Col. iii. 1 ff.). Meier: "Exaltation into a celestially enlightened. pure and holy, state of life." Matthies: "The spiritual kingdom of heaven or of God." Olshausen: "The awakening of the heavenly consciousness." Koppe remarks superficially and with hesitation: "Nobis quidem in omnibus, 'in all these terms,' his ζωοποιεῖσθαι ἐγείρεσθαι, καθίζειν ἐν ἐπουρ. nihil inesse videtur nisi summae et universae felicitatis, qua Christiani vel jam fruuntur, vel olim magis etiam fruituri sunt, descriptio," "nothing seems to us to be included but a description of the supreme and universal happiness which Christians either already or will hereafter enjoy." According to Baumgarten-Crusius, there is expressed "exaltation into a purely spiritual heaven-like state." De Wette takes συνεζωοπ. of the deliverance out of the misery of sin, συνήγειρε of regeneration and, *at the same time*, of the resurrection of the body guaranteed in the spiritual life, and συνεκάθισεν κ.τ.λ. of the hope of the eternal δόξα. Schenkel interprets it of the *presentiment* of the future glory.

[2] Bengel.

[3] Jerome.

[4] Olshausen.

[5] Comp. already Estius.

[6] Comp. LXX. Isa. xliv. 7, xlv. 11; Judith ix. 5; 3 Macc. v. 2; Luke xxi. 26; Jas. v. 1; Hom. *Od.* xxiv. 142; Thuc. i. 126; Plat. *Soph.* p. 234 D; Aesch. *Prom.* 98: τὸ παρὸν τό τ' ἐπερχόμενον, Pind. *Ol.* x. 11: ἕκαθεν γὰρ ἐπελθὼν ὁ μέλλων χρόνος.

Ver. 8. How entirely was I justified in saying: τὸ ὑπερβάλλον πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ! *for*, etc. Thus Paul now expresses himself with more detail as to the great truth, of which his heart was so full that it had already, ver. 5, interrupted the course of his address. — τῇ χάριτι] *by the grace.* By the article *the divine* grace *just now spoken of* is indicated, after it had been meant doubtless by the anarthrous χάριτι, ver. 5, but designated by it only as regards the category (*by grace*). — διὰ τῆς πίστεως] for the faith in the atonement made by Christ (Rom. iii. 25, 30, *al.*) is, as the *causa apprehendens*, "apprehending cause," of the Messianic salvation, the necessary *mediate instrument* on the part of man, while the χάρις is the divine motive, the *causa efficiens*, "efficient cause," of the bestowal. The emphasis, however, is retained by τῇ χάριτι *alone*, and διὰ τῆς πίστ. is only the modal definition to σεσωσμ. — καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.] Nothing is here to be treated as parenthesis; neither the whole καὶ τοῦτο down to ἔργων, ver. 9,[1] nor merely Θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον,[2] since neither the construction nor the course of thought is interrupted. καὶ τοῦτο is referred by the Fathers in Suicer,[3] Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Estius, Wolf, Bengel, Michaelis, and others, including Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bisping, to the *faith* (τὸ πιστεύειν), comp. Phil. i. 29 ; 2 Cor. iv. 14. In that case καὶ τοῦτο . . . δῶρον would have to be taken parenthetically. But how violent is this taking to pieces of the text, since οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν and οὐκ ἐξ ἐργων present themselves in a manner alike natural and weighty as elements belonging to *one flow* of the discourse ! Rightly, therefore, have Calvin, Calovius, Baumgarten, Semler, Zachariae, Morus, and others, including Rückert, Matthies, Holzhausen, Harless, de Wette, Schenkel, Bleek, referred it to the *salvation just designated* as regards its specific mode. Paul very earnestly and emphatically enters into more detailed explanations as to what he had just said, τῇ γὰρ χάριτι κ.τ.λ., namely, to the effect that he briefly and forcibly places in the light of the respective contrasts, first, that *objective* element of the saving deliverance which has taken place (τῇ χάριτι) by οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, Θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον, and then the *subjective* element (διὰ τῆς πίστεως), by οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἵνα μ. τ. καυχ. His thought is : "Through grace you are in possession of salvation by means of faith, *and that to the exclusion of your own causation and operative agency.*" This latter he expresses with the vivacity and force of contrast thus : "*and that* (καὶ τοῦτο, see on Rom. xiii. 11) *not from you, it is God's gift ; not from works, in order that no one may boast.*" The asyndetic juxtaposition takes place with a "propria quadam vi, alacritate, gravitate," "peculiar force, ardor, and dignity."[4] — οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν] negatives their own personal authorship of the salvation.[5] — Θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον] *i.e.*, Θεοῦ δῶρον τὸ δῶρον, *God's gift is the gift* in question (namely, the σεσωσμένον εἶναι). Comp. already Bengel. — οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων] Parallel of οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, hence to be completed by ἐστὲ σεσωσμένοι (not by τὸ δῶρόν ἐστι), *not from work-merit does it come* that you have the salvation. The ἔργα would exclude the πίστις as the *subjective* condition of salvation (Rom. iii. 28, iv. 5, ix. 32 ; Gal. ii. 16, iii. 2), as ἐξ ὑμῶν would exclude the χάρις as the *objective* cause of salvation, because it presupposes the ἰδία δικαιοσύνη (Rom. x. 3). No doubt ἐξ ἔργων excludes also the χάρις, as does likewise ἐξ ὑμῶν exclude the πίστις ; but the two elements opposed to the χάρις and the πίστις are, on occasion of the proposition τῇ γὰρ χάριτι . . . πίστεως, held apart after the manner of a formal *parallelism.* That, moreover, the *notion* of the ἔργα is determined not merely by the *Jewish* law, but—inasmuch as the readers were for the most part Gentile-Christians—also by the *natural* law (Rom. ii. 14 f.), is self-evident. The proposition in itself, however, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, is so essential and universally valid a fundamental proposition of the Pauline Gospel, and certainly so often expressed by the apostle among Jews and Gentiles, that the severe judgment as to its having no meaning, when laid down without reference to the Mosaic law, must appear unfounded.[1] — ἵνα] *design of God* in the relation indicated by οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, not *ecbatic.*[2] Comp. 1 Cor. i. 29, 31, and as regards the thing itself, Rom. iii. 27. Grotius aptly says: "quicquid est in flumine, fonti debetur," "whatever is in the river, is due the fountain," which, however, is not to be limited merely to the *prima gratia.* [See Note XIX., p. 400.] See ver. 10; 2 Cor. x. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 10.

---

[1] Comp. Calvin, Piscator, Boyd, Estius, Calixtus, Michaelis, Zachariae, Meier, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek.

[2] Schenkel.

[3] Flatt.

[4] Schenkel.

[5] Comp. Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 195; van Hengel, *ad Rom.* II. p. 682.

---

[1] Griesbach, Scholz.

[2] Lachmann, Harless, de Wette.

[3] *Thes.* II. p. 728.

[4] Dissen, *Exc. II. ad Pind.* p. 273.

[5] Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 551 f.

Ver. 10. Reason assigned for the previous οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν . . . καυχήσ. If, namely, we are God's ποίημα, our Messianic salvation cannot be of our own acquiring, but only *God's* gift; and if we are *created* in Christ unto good works, how could merit of works (which would need to have been already acquired in the time *anterior* to this our creation) be the cause of our salvation, and subject of our own boasting? The argumentative stress lies consequently (1) on αὐτοῦ, and (2) on κτισθέντες; and then οἷς προητοίμασεν κ.τ.λ. is an elucidation significantly bearing on κτισθέντες ἐν Χ. Ἰ. ἐπὶ ἔργ. ἀγ., which makes the impossibility of pre-Christian merit of works thoroughly palpable. — αὐτοῦ] with emphasis: *His*, just *His* work, and no other's, are we.[3] — ποίημα, *thing made* (comp. Rom. i. 20), refers to the *ethical* creation (that of the new spiritual state of life), which the Christian as such has experienced (παλιγγενεσία, Tit. iii. 5), not, as Tert. *c. Marc.* v. 17, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil, and Photius would have it, to the *physical* creation (the spiritual being only introduced by κτισθέντες κ.τ.λ.), which is opposed to the context, as is also the combination of *the two* creations by Pelagius, Erasmus, Matthies, and Rückert: "as *Christians* we . . . are God's work just as well, as in respect of our being *men* at all." Only the *form*, in which the constituting of the new condition of life is expressed, is derived from the physical creation. — κτισθέντες] by *God* at our conversion. — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] for εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις, 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15. Christ is the specific element of life, within which the ethical ποίημα Θεοῦ has come to pass, but apart from which this creative process has not taken place. — ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς] moral *aim.*[4] On the thing itself, comp. Rom. viii. That, *by which* God prepares what is created by Him in Christ for this moral end, is the Holy Spirit, Rom. viii.; Gal. iii. 2; John iii. 5 f. *Good works* (not ἔργα νόμου) are fruits of *regeneration*, different from ἔργων, ver. 9. — οἷς προητοίμ. ὁ Θεός] οἷς is to be taken, according to the usual attraction (see Winer, p. 147 f.), for ἅ:[5] *which God hath before* (previously to the κτισθέντες) *placed in readiness, in order that we might walk in them*, that they might be the element in which our life-walk should take place.[6] The prefixed προητ. has in the circumstances significant emphasis. Paul conceives, namely, of the morally good works in which the walk of the Christian moves, as being already, even before his conversion, *placed in readiness*[7] by God, namely, in His decree. And this *could not but* be the case, if God would *create* unto good works. For, if the converted man is God's *creature*, then the moral activity of life, in which the specific nature of the καινὴ κτίσις is to manifest itself, and without which he would *not* be God's ποίημα and κτίσις, must likewise proceed from God; consequently, when the moral creative act (the regeneration) is accomplished, it must already in God's counsel and will, be in such wise *prepared* and *held ready* for communication, that it has to receive the new creature from its Creator, and in this way to work the works of *God*. Thus these good works following regeneration are as it were outflowings from a divine treasure beforehand placed in readiness, from which the regenerate man has *received* them, when he *does* them and *walks* in them.[1] The sense of the word προετοιμάζειν is changed, if it is explained only as *to predestine*,[2] which would be expressed by προορίζειν;[3] and it is *rationalized away* when Olshausen says that the *circumstances and relations*, under which it is *possible* to men to perform good works, are ordained by God. It is not of the *circumstances* which render the works possible, but of the *works themselves*, that Paul affirms that God has before placed them in readiness; as accordingly, when they are accomplished, it is God who works the *willing* and *working* (Phil. ii. 13). According to Hofmann,[4] the good works are once for all present *in Christ*, so that they need not to be brought forth first by us, the individuals, but are produced beforehand, in order that our fellowship with Christ may be also a fellowship of His conduct—that our walk in *Him* may be a walk in *them*. But in this way Paul would have left the very point of the thought in προητοίμ. (namely, *in Christ*) unexpressed. Others take οἷς as dative of the *destination: unto which God hath prepared us*.[5] In this case, ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπ. would by no means be a redundant and feeble tautology, as Harless supposes, but an emphatic epexegesis of οἷς. But against this view it may be urged that Paul must necessarily, because the verb would be quite objectless, have added ἡμᾶς,[6] the omission of which, considering the frequency of the attraction of οἷς for ἅ, could only have led the reader astray; moreover, προ would receive no emphasis accordant with the prefixing of προητοίμ., inasmuch as the time of the προετοιμάζειν would coincide with that of the κτίζειν. Valla and Erasmus take οἷς as *masculine; for whom He hath before appointed*, that we, etc., to which also Rückert, although hesitating between this and the preceding explanation, is inclined. But how arbitrarily in this way is οἷς referred to what is more remote and different from

---

[1] In opposition to de Wette.

[2] Koppe, Flatt, Holzhausen.

[3] Comp. Hom. *Od.* x. 27: αὐτῶν γὰρ ἀπωλόμεθ' ἀφραδίῃσιν. Winer, p. 140.

[4] [Cf. Winer, § 48.]

[5] Syriac, Gothic, Vulgate, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Estius, Grotius, and others, including Harless, Matthies, Holzhausen, Olshausen, de Wette, Lamping, p. 87 f.; Bleek.

[6] τὴν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἄπαυστον σχέσιν δηλοῖ, "He shows the never-ending state for them," Oecumenius.

[7] Plut. *Mor.* p. 230 E; Joseph. *Antt.* xvii 5, 6; LXX. Isa. xxviii. 24; Wisd. ix. 8.

---

[1] Explanations like that of Grotius; "praeparavit tum praescribendo formam operum tum dando Spiritum," "He prepared them both by prescribing the form of the works, and by giving the Spirit," etc., fail of doing justice to the case by making προ in προητ. *synchronous* with κτισθέντες.

[2] Augustine and others, including Harless, Lamping.

[3] See Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 339.

[4] *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 365, II. 2, p. 294.

[5] Luther, Clericus, Semler, Michaelis, Zachariae, Morus, Flatt, Meier, Schenkel, and others.

[6] This also in opposition to Calovius, who takes οἷς in the *ablative* sense: "*quibus*, sc. hactenus dictis . . . per justificationem et renovationem, *praeparavit* vel disposuit (nos), *ut in operibus bonis ambulemus*," "by which, viz., these hitherto mentioned, through justification or renewal he prepared or disposed us, so that we may walk in good works."

αὐτοῖς! and how changed is the literal sense of *προετοιμάζειν*! Utterly arbitrary and erroneous, finally, is the view of Bengel, Koppe, and Rosenmüller, as also of Baumgarten-Crusius, that it is to be explained *per Hebraismum*, "as a Hebraism,"[1] for *ἐν οἷς ἵνα περιπατήσωμεν προητ. ὁ Θεός*, in which case Koppe and Rosenmüller make *προετοιμάζειν* equivalent to *velle jubere*, "wish, bid!"—According to Schwegler,[2] Baur,[3] and de Wette, there is to be discovered in our passage the post-apostolic tendency to combine the doctrine of Paul (*οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων*) with the Jewish-Christian view (that of James) concerning good works. As though the works were not in our passage too, as in all Pauline Epistles, based upon faith (observe, withal, *ἐν* X. 'I.)!—The Pauline faith has always moral practice as its necessary vital activity, and this is consequently always the aim (not: *ultimate* aim) of the new creation wrought through faith by means of the Spirit. We may add that the good works, even at our passage,—where, moreover, they are traced back wholly to God as the author,—are so far from being the condition of justification, that, on the contrary, the dogmatic canon here receives full confirmation: "*Bona opera non praecedunt justificandum, sed sequuntur justificatum*," "Good works do not precede the one to be justified, but they follow him as justified." Comp. Calovius. Aptly does Bengel remark on *περιπατ.*: "*ambularemus*, non *salvaremur* aut *viveremus*," "that we should walk, not that we should be saved, or should live." The assertion, that here (and in Colossians) much greater importance is ascribed to good works than in the other letters of the apostle,[4] is, looking even to vv. 7–9, incorrect. [See Note XX., p. 400.]

Ver. 11. *Διό*] *Therefore*, because such exalted and unmerited benefits have been imparted to us (vv. 4–10). [See Note XXI., p. 400 seq.] These benefits should move the reader to remember his former miserable heathen state (*ποτέ*, v. 8; Col. i. 21), in order the more gratefully to appreciate, by contrast with the past, the value of his present state. — *ὅτι ποτὲ ὑμεῖς τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί*] Neither *ἦτε* nor *ὄντες* is to be supplied, but (observe the order critically vouched for: *ποτὲ ὑμεῖς*) *ὅτι* is taken up again by the *ὅτι* of ver. 12, and *ποτέ* by *τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ*, ver. 12; while *τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί* is a descriptive definition to *ὑμεῖς*, to which it is related by way of apposition, and *οἱ λεγόμενοι κ.τ.λ.* is attributive definition to *ὑμεῖς τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί*: *that at one time ye, the Gentiles in the flesh, ye who* (quippe qui) *were named Foreskin . . . that ye at that time*, etc. — *τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί*] is closely connected as *one* conception, and hence without the article before *ἐν σαρκί*. This *ἐν σαρκί* is, as to its meaning, necessarily defined by the undoubted meaning of the following *ἐν σαρκί*; on which account it is neither to be taken, as a contrast to regeneration, of the former *unholy life* of the readers,[5] nor as *origine carnali, natalibus*, "by carnal origin, birth,"[6] nor is it to be generalized into *respectu status externi*, "with respect to the external condition."[7] It has reference to the *foreskin*. In the *flesh*, on account of the non-circumcised foreskin, the *character ethnicus*, "Gentile character," was inherent.—The τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σ., with *the article*, designates the readers as to their *category*. The *contempt*, however, incurred in their pre-Christian state lies not in τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σ. (for this they still remained), but in the following οἱ λεγόμενοι κ.τ.λ.; although we may not, by mentally supplying[1] the contrast οὐκ ἐν πνεύματι, make ἐν σαρκί into an element of *recommendation*. — οἱ λεγόμενοι . . . χειροπ.] is not to be placed in a parenthesis,[2] seeing that it is a continued description of the Gentile state of the readers. As the ἔθνη τῇ σαρκί, they were *those designated by the name Foreskin!* And, then, the delineation of this despised relation is brought to a yet higher climax when it is specified *by whom* they were thus reproachfully designated, namely, *by the so-called Circumcision, which is made in the flesh with the hand.* So low was the position you occupied! By those who bear the name of this surgical operation performed on the flesh (counterpart of the ideal circumcision, Rom. ii. 28 f.; Phil. iii. 3; Col. ii. 11; Acts vii. 51), and hence have by it in and of itself no pre-eminence at all, you must allow yourselves to be designated, for want of this external rite, with the reproachful name of *Foreskin!* ἐν σαρκὶ χειροπ. does not pertain to λεγομ., but is an addition *of the apostle himself* to περιτ., describing how the *matter* stands. The abstracta, "abstracts," ἀκροβ. and περιτ. do not here stand *pro concretis*, "for concretes," but are stated *names*, by which the concretes were in accordance with their peculiar character *designated*. Comp. 2 Thess. ii. 4: ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον Θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα. The circumstance that Paul, instead of ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης, has not again employed the plural expression ὑπὸ τῶν λεγομένων, is to be explained by the fact that he wishes to indicate the περιτομή as a name, which is not adequate to the idea of it in the case of the subjects so termed: by the *so-called* circumcision. [See Note XXII., p. 401.] The expression is *depreciatory* (comp. 1 Cor. viii. 5) as concerns the people who bore the name περιτομή; whereas οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία would indicate not the conception of "so-called," but, in a purely objective manner, the mentioned fact: "those called Foreskin" (Heb. ix. 3).

---

[1] See, on the other hand, Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 139.

[2] In Zeller's *Jahrb.* 1844, p. 391.

[3] *Paulus*, p. 453.

[4] Baur, *neut. Theol.* p. 270.

[5] Ambrosiaster, Calovius, Wolf, Holzhausen.

[6] Bucer, Grotius, Estius, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt.

[7] Morus.

Ver. 12. As regards the construction, see on ver. 11. — τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ] takes the place of the ποτέ, ver. 11, and means the pre-Christian, heathen period of the readers. On the *dative* of *time* without ἐν, see Winer, p. 195 f. — χωρὶς Χριστοῦ] *aloof from connection with Christ;* for "χωρίς ad subjectum, quod ab objecto sejunctum est, refertur," "is referred to the subject which is separated from the object."[3] It is dependent on ἦτε as its first sad predicate, and does not belong, as a more precise definition, to the subject,[4] in which case it would in fact be entirely self-evident and superfluous. *In how far* the readers as Gentiles were without Christ, we are told in the sequel. They stood afar off and aloof from the theocratic bond, in which Christ would have been to them, in accordance with the promise, the object of their faith and ground of their salvation. If Paul had wished to express merely the *negation of the Christian relation*,[5] how tame and idle would this in itself have been! and, moreover, not in keeping with the connection of that which follows, according to which, as is already clear from ver. 11, Paul wishes to bring out the disadvantage at which the readers, as Gentiles, had been placed *in contradistinction to the Jews.* Hence Grotius rightly indicates the relation as to contrast of ver. 12 to ver. 13: "Nunc eum (Christum) non minus possidetis vos *quam ii, quibus promissus fuerat,*" "Now ye possess Him (Christ) no less *than they to whom He had been promised.*" Rückert refers χωρὶς Χ. to the *activity of Christ under the O. T. previously to His incarnation,* with an appeal to 1 Cor. x. 4.[1] But τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ, in fact, applies to the pre-Christian *lifetime of the readers,* and thus comprises a time which was *subsequent to the incarnation.* Χριστοῦ means *the historical Christ,* so far as He *was* the very promised Messiah. The relation χωρὶς Χριστοῦ is described from the standpoint *of the apostle,* for whom the bond with the *Messiah* was the bond with *Christ.* [See Note XXIII., p. 401.] — The charge that the author here makes an un-Pauline concession to Judaism[2] is incorrect, since the concession concerns only the *pre-Christian* relation. Comp. Rom. ix. 4, 5. A superiority of Judaism, in respect of the pre-Christian relation to Christianity, Paul could not but necessarily teach (comp. Acts iii. 25 f.; Rom. i. 16, iii. 1 f.; Gal. iii. 13 f.); but that Christianity as to its essential contents was Judaism itself, merely extended through the death of Christ to the Gentiles also, he has not taught either here or elsewhere; in fact, the doing away of the law taught by him in this very passage is the very opposite thereof.[3] — ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι κ.τ.λ.] Comp. on ἀπαλλοτριόω, Dem. 255, 3; Polyb. i. 79. 6, i. 82. 9; often in the LXX.[4] and Josephus, Krebs, *Obss.* p. 326. The notion of *alien* does not here (comp. also iv. 18; Col. i. 21) presuppose the existence of an earlier fellowship, but it was their *status ethnicus,* "Gentile state," *itself,*[5] by which the readers were at one time placed apart from connection with the πολιτεία τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. *i.e.*, whereby this ἀλλοτριότης took place. The opposite: ἴδιοι, οἰκεῖοι, συμπολῖται (ver. 19). πολιτεία signifies as well *political constitution*[6] as *right of citizenship.*[7] The latter signification is assumed by Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Bullinger, Michaelis, and others. But the idea of right of citizenship was for the apostle, himself a Roman citizen, as well as for the readers, a *secular* privilege, and one therefore foreign to the connection of our passage, where everything points to the *theocracy,* and this was the *political constitution* of the Israelites. — τοῦ Ἰσραήλ] The divine name of Jacob (Gen. xxxii. 28, xxxv. 10) is, according to the traditionally hallowed usage of the O. T., the theocratic name of his posterity, the Jewish people, Rom. ix. 6 ; 1 Cor. x. 18 ; Gal. vi. 16, *al.* The *genitive*, however, is not to be explained like ἄστυ 'Αθηνῶν ;[1] for ὁ 'Ισραήλ is the people, which *has* the polity. — καὶ ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγ.] *and foreign to the covenants of the promise* (not belonging thereto) ; these words are to be taken *together ;*[2] for only thus do the two elements belonging to each other and connected by καί, which serve for the elucidation of χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, stand in harmonious symmetry ; only in this way, likewise, is similar justice done to the two last particulars connected by καί,—ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ—which in their very generality and brevity carry the description of the Gentile misery to the uttermost point ; only in this way, lastly, does ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν acquire the characteristic coloring which it needs, in order not to appear tame after ἀπηλλοτρ. τ. πολ. τ. 'Ισρ., for precisely in the characteristic τῆς ἐπαγγ. lies the *sad significance* of the being apart from the πολιτεία τοῦ 'Ισραήλ. *The covenants of the promise, i.e.*, the covenants with which its promise κατ' ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminently," namely, that of the *Messianic salvation* (Rom. ix. 4 ; Gal. iii.), was connected, are the covenants made with Abraham (Gen. xii. 2 f., 7, xiii. 15, xv. 18, xvii. 20, xxii. 16 ff.) and repeated with the other patriarchs (Gen. xxvi. 2 ff., xxviii. 13 ff.), as also the covenant formed with the people through Moses. The latter is here (it is otherwise at Rom. ix. 4, where there specially follows ἡ νομοθεσία) neither excluded,[3] seeing that this covenant also had the promise of Messianic life (ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς, Gal. iii. 12), nor exclusively meant.[4] Either is arbitrary, and against the latter there may be urged specially the plural, as well as the eminent importance which Paul must have attributed to the patriarchal covenants in particular.[5] — ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχ. κ. ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κ.] consequence of the preceding ἀπηλλοτρ. . . . ἐπαγγ., and in what a tragic climax ! The very *generality* of the expressions, inasmuch as it is not merely a definite hope (Paul did not write τὴν ἐλπίδα) and a definite relation to God that are denied, renders these last traits of the picture so dark ! — ἐλπίδα] Bengel : "Si promissionem habuissent, spem habuissent illi respondentem," "if they would have had the promise, they would have had the hope corresponding thereto." But in this way Paul must have written τὴν ἐλπίδα. No, those shut out from the promise, are for the apostle men *without hope at all ;* they have *nothing* to hope for, just because they have not to hope for the *promised salvation.* Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 13. Every explanation of a *definite* hope[6] conflicts with the absence of the article, and weakens the force of the picture. — μὴ ἔχοντες] μή is not to be explained from the dependence of the thought on what immediately precedes,[7] by which the independence of the element ἐλπ. μὴ ἔχ. would be sacrificed to the injury of the symmetry and force of the passage; but the subjectivity of the negation results from μνημονεύετε, ὅτι . . . ἦτε, in accordance with which μὴ ἔχοντες is a fact now *conceived* in the recollection of the readers.[1] The μή refers the ἐλπ. μὴ ἔχ. to the conception of the subject of the governing *verbum sentiendi* (μνημονεύετε). — ἄθεοι] the lowest stage of Gentile misery. We may explain the word,[2] which occurs only here in the N. T., and not at all in the LXX. or Apocrypha, either: *not believing in God*, atheists,[3] or *godless*, *impii*, reprobate,[4] or: *without God*, *sine Deo* (Vulgate), *i.e.*, *without divine help*, without the protection and assistance of God.[5] The last-mentioned sense, as yielding the *saddest* closing predicate,[6] is here to be preferred. The Gentiles had gods, which, however, were no gods (Acts xix. 26, xiv. 15; Gal. iv. 8); but, on the contrary, what they worshipped and honored as divinities, since the forsaking of the natural knowledge of God (Rom. i. 19 ff.), were demons (1 Cor. x. 20); so that for them with all their δεισιδαιμονία (Acts xvii. 22) God was really *wanting*, and they apart from connection with God's grace and help lived on in a *God-forsaken* state. Paul might have written θεοστυγεῖς, as at Rom. i. 30, but he continues in the stream of *negative* designations, which gives to his picture an *elegiac* coloring. — ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ] is referred by Calovius and Koppe to the preceding elements as a whole. But in this way it would have something of a dragging effect, whereas it attaches itself with force and suggestiveness to the bare ἄθεοι, whose tragical effect it serves to deepen. Only it must not be explained, even when so connected, with Koppe: "*inter ceteros homines, in his terris*," "among other men in these lands," in which sense it would be devoid of significance. Nay rather, *profane humanity* (observe the contrast to the πολιτεία τοῦ Ἰσραήλ), the *Gentile world*, was the unhallowed domain, in which the readers in former time existed without God. It adds to the ungodly *How* the ungodly *Where*. Olshausen explains: "in this *evil* world, in which one has such urgent need of a sure hope, a fast hold to the living God;" but this is *imported*, since no predicate stands beside κόσμῳ. According to Rückert, it is to form a contrast to ἄθεοι, and that in the sense: "in the world, of which the earth is a part, and which stands under God's government."[7] But Paul must have *said* this, if he had meant it (by ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, or something similar). Oecumenius and Meier: ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὸν παρόντα βίον πολιτείᾳ, "in the commonwealth according to the present life," etc. This would be expressed by κατὰ τὸν κόσμον. — The question, we may add, whether the ἐλπίδα . . . κόσμῳ applies to *all* Gentiles, not even a Socrates or a Plato excepted, is, in the

---

[1] With Chrysostom and his successors.

[2] Griesbach, Scholz.

[3] Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 94.

[4] "When ye were as yet without Christ," Bleek.

[5] Ye were without knowledge of Christ; comp. Anselm, Calovius, Flatt.

---

[1] Comp. Olshausen ("the immanence of Christ as regards His divinity in Israel").

[2] Schwegler, *l.c.* p. 388 f.

[3] In opposition to Baur, *Paulus,* p. 545; *Christenth. der drei ersten Jahrh.* p. 107.

[4] Schleusner, *Thesaur.* I. p. 325.

[5] Not, as Grotius would have it (whom Rosenmüller follows): the diversity of political institutions: "In illa republica a Deo instituta non modo honores non poteratis capere, sed nec pro civibus haberi; *adeo distabant instituta,*" "In the state established by God you were not only not able to receive honors, but not even to be held as citizens; to such an extent did the institutions differ."

[6] Thuc. ii. 36; Plato, *Polit.* vii. p. 520 B; *Legg.* iv. p. 712 E; Arist. *Polit.* iii. 4. 1; Isoc. *Evag.* viii. 10; Xen. *Ages.* i. 37; 2 Macc. iv. 11, viii. 17.

[7] Herod. ix. 34; Dem. 161, 11; Thuc. vi. 104. 3; Diod. Sic. xii. 51; 3 Macc. iii. 21; Acts xxii. 28; Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 3. 1.

---

[1] Harless.

[2] In opposition to Ambrosiaster, Cornelius à Lapide, Morus, Rosenmüller, and others, who attach τῆς ἐπαγγ. to what follows.

[3] Rückert, Harless, Olshausen, and others.

[4] Elsner and Wolf, as was already suggested by Beza.

[5] On ξένος with a *genitive* (Kühner, II. p. 163), Comp. Xen. *Cyr.* vi. 2. 1 ; Soph. *Oed. R.* 219 ; Plato, *Apol.* p. 17 D, *al.*

[6] Of the resurrection and life everlasting, Bullinger, Grotius, and many ; of the promised blessings, Estius ; of deliverance, Harless ; comp. Erasmus and others.

[7] "Foreign to the covenants of the promise, *without having hope,*" as Harless would take it.

---

[1] Comp. Kühner, II. § 715, 3.

[2] See, generally, Diog. Laert. vii. 119; Sturz in the *Comm. soc. phil. Lips.* II. p. 65 ff.; Meier in the *Hall. Encykl.* I. 24, p. 466 ff.

[3] Plato, *Apol.* p. 26 C; Lucian, *Alex.* 25; Aelian, *V. H.* ii. 31; comp. Ignat. *ad Trall.* 10: ἄθεοι ὄντες, τουτέστιν ἄπιστοι.

[4] Plato, *Legg.* xii. p. 966 E; Xen. *Anab.* ii. 5. 39; Pindar, *Pyth.* iv. 288.

[5] Soph. *Oed. R.* 633: ἄθεος, ἄφιλος, comp. 254.

[6] Comp. ἀθεεί, Hom. *Od.* xviii. 352; Mosch, ii. 148. [See also Cremer's Wörterbuch, Eng. Trans. p. 281.]

[7] So in substance also Grotius: "per omnes terrarum oras verum Deum, *mundi sc. opificem*, aut ignorabatis, aut certe non colebatis, sed pro eo Deos ab hominibus fictos," "In all regions of the earth, ye either were ignorant of the true God, viz., the Creator of the world, or certainly did not worship Him, but instead of Him worshipped the gods made by man."

view of the apostle, to be answered affirmatively, at all events in general (Rom. iii. 10 ff., xi. 16 ff.; 1 Cor. i. 19 ff.), but has only an indirect application here, since the apostle is speaking of his *readers*, whom he describes as to their *category*. That, if the subject of his discourse had called for it, he would have known how to set *limitations* to his general judgment, may be assumed of itself, and in accordance with Rom. ii. 14 f. Comp. Acts xvii. 28.

Ver. 13. *But now in Christ Jesus ye, once afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ.* — νυνὶ δέ] contrast to τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ, ver. 12 : *but as your relation now stands.* Comp. Rom. vi. 22, vii. 6 ; Col. i. 21, iii. 8. — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] not to be supplemented by ἐστέ,[1] nor yet a more precise definition of νυνί,[2] in which case several, proceeding more accurately, supply ὄντες.[3] But such a more precise definition would be very unnecessary, and would have significant weight only if a special emphasis rested upon ἐν as in contradistinction to χωρίς, ver. 12, which, however, cannot be the case, since there is not again used merely ἐν Χριστῷ, but ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. The ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ εἶναι of the readers, moreover, was not *prior* to the ἐγγὺς ἐγενήθητε, but its immediate *consequence ;* hence we should have at least to explain it, not : *postquam* in Christo estis recepti, "*After* ye were received in Christ," but : *cum* in Christo sitis recepti, "*When* ye were received," wherewithal there would still remain the very unnecessary character of this more precise definition, or of this conditional accessory clause (de Wette). Accordingly ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. is to be connected with ἐγγὺς ἐγενήθ. : *ye are in Christ Jesus*, in whom this has its efficient cause, *made near ;* and ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χρ. is then the more precise definition of the mode of ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. Comp. διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, i. 7. Hence we have not to place a comma, as Lachmann and Tischendorf have done, either before or after ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. — Ἰησοῦ] could not be added at ver. 12, but might be added here, where the Christ who historically appeared in the person of Jesus is intended. — μακράν] figurative description of the same relation as was expressed in ver. 12 by ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτ. τοῦ Ἰσρ., and ξένοι τῶν διαθηκ. τῆς ἐπαγγ. — ἐγγὺς ἐγενήθ. ἐν τῷ αἵμ. τ. Χρ.] For, by the fact that Christ shed His blood, the separation of the Gentiles from the Jews was done away, and consequently the fellowship of the former with the community of God's people (which the true Christian Israel henceforth was) was effected. See ver. 14 ff. The *bringing to participation in the blessings of the theocracy* is, after the precedent of Isa. xlix. 1, lvii. 19, expressed often also among the Rabbins by the figurative *propinquum facere*, "to make near" (which with them is, with special frequency, equivalent to *proselytum facere*, "to make a proselyte"), and in that case the subject to whom the approach is made is always to be derived from the context.[4] — ἐγγὺς γίνεσθαι, *to come near ;* only here in the N. T., frequent in the classic writers.[5]

---

[1] Baumgarten-Crusius.

[2] Rückert : "under the new constitution, founded by Christ."

[3] Calvin : "postquam in Christo estis recepti," "after ye were received in Christ," Koppe, Harless, Bleek.

[4] As *e.g. Vayikra R.* 14, where *God*, and *Mechilta*, f. 38. 12, where, as here, the *theocracy* is to be thought of. See, in general, the passage in Wetstein and Schöttgen, *Horae*, p. 761 ff.

[5] Xen. *Anab.* v. 4. 16, iv. 7. 23 ; Thuc. iii. 40. 6.

Ver. 14.[1] Confirmatory elucidation to ver. 13, especially as to the element implied in the ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, and more precisely in the ἐν τῷ αἵματ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ. — αὐτός] *ipse; as regards his own person*,[2] is not put in opposition to the thought of *ourselves* having made the peace,[3] which is in fact quite foreign to the passage; but—and what a triumph of the certainty and completeness of the blessing obtained is therein implied!—"non modo *pacificator*, nam *sui impensa* pacem peperit et ipse vinculum est utrorumque," "not merely the peacemaker, for at the cost of himself he procured peace, and he himself is the bond of both," Bengel. See what follows. Observe also the *presence of the article* in ἡ εἰρήνη, denoting the peace κατ' ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminently;"[4] He is for us the peace absolutely, the absolute contrast to the ἔχθρα, ver. 15. The Rabbinical passages, however, in which the Messiah (Comp. Isa. ix. 6) is called שלום, "peace,"[5] do not bear on this passage, since in them the point spoken of is not, as here,[6] the peace *between Jews and Gentiles.* — ὁ ποιήσας κ.τ.λ.] *quippe qui fecit*, "since he has made," etc., now begins the more precise information, *how* Christ *has become* Himself our peace. — τὰ ἀμφότερα] *the two* [Germ. *das Beides*], *i.e.*, the two existing parts, the Jews and Gentiles. The *neuter* expression corresponds to the following ἕν. Nothing is to be supplied.[7] — ἕν] not so, that one part assumed the nature of the other, but so that the separation of the two was done away with, and both were raised to a *new* unity. *That* was the union of the divine οἰκονομία. See the sequel. Comp. Col. iii. 11; Gal. iii. 28; Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 13; John x. 16. — καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φρ. λύσας] is related to the foregoing as *explicative* of it.[8] τοῦ φραγμοῦ is genitive of *apposition:* the partition wall, *which consisted in the* (well-known) *fence.* What is meant by this, we are then told by means of the epexegetic τὴν ἔχθραν; hence Paul has not by the figurative τὸ μεσότ. τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας merely wished to express the (negative) conception that Christ has done away with the isolation of the O. T. commonwealth.[9] De Wette censures the "extreme *tameness*" of the explanation, according to which τὸ μεσότ. κ.τ.λ. is taken not as a designation of the *law*, but as a preliminary designation of the ἔχθρα. But the twofold designation of the matter, describing it first figuratively and then properly, is in keeping with the *importance* of the idea, the direct expression of which produces after the previous figure an effect the *more striking.* — To take the genitive in an *adjectival* sense, as equivalent to τὸ μεσότοιχον διαφράσσον,[10] is wrong, because the characteristic adjective notion is implied in τὸ μεσότοιχον,[11] which has been felt also by Castalio and Beza, inasmuch as they erroneously translated it as though *τὸν φραγμὸν τοῦ μεσοτοίχου* were used. A reference, we may add, to a *definite φραγμός*, which underlies the figurative expression, is not to be assumed, since the words furnish nothing of the sort, and *any kind* of fence serving as a partition-wall illustrates the *ἔχθρα*. Some have thought of the stone screen which in the temple-enclosure marked off the court of the Gentiles, and the inscription of which forbade every Gentile from farther advance.[1] But at most this could only be assumed, without arbitrariness, if that screen had statedly borne the name of *φραγμός*. Other references, still more foreign to the matter, which have been introduced, such as to the Jewish districts in large towns, which were marked off by a wall or otherwise,[2] may be seen in Wolf. Among the Rabbins, too, the figure of a fence is in very frequent use. See Buxtorf, *s.v.* סיג. — *λύσας*] in the sense of throwing down,[3] belongs to the *figure*, and is not chosen on account of the *τὴν ἔχθραν*, which does not come in till afterwards, although it would be chosen *suitably* thereto.[4] — It has been wrongly designated as an *un-Pauline* idea, that Christ through His death should have united the Jews and Gentiles by means of the abolition of the law.[5] This union has in fact taken place as a raising of both into a higher unity, vv. 16, 18, 21 f.; hence that doctrinal principle is sufficiently explained from the destination of Paul as the apostle to the Gentiles and his personal experience, and from his own elsewhere attested universalism, and need not have as a presupposition the post-apostolic process of development on the part of the church gradually gathering itself out of heterogeneous elements into a unity, so as to betray a later "catholicizing tendency."[6]

---

[1] "Ver. 14–18 ipse verborum tenere et quasi rhythmo canticum imitatur," "He imitates poetry by the very tenor and as it were rhythm of the words," Bengel.

[2] ["He personally, as in Micah v. 4," Delitzsch, *Luth. Zeitschr.* 1878, p. 3; also Holtzmann, p. 244.—*Schmidt.*]

[3] Hofmann.

[4] Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 109 [E. T. 125].

[5] Wetstein *in loc.;* Schöttgen, *Horae*, II. p. 18.

[6] In opposition to Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 374, who, at variance with the context, understands εἰρήνη primarily in relation to God; similarly Calovius and others.

[7] Grotius: γένη.

[8] καί, see Winer, p. 388; Fritzsche, *Quaest. Luc.* p. 9 f.

[9] As Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 375, holds, refining on τὸ μεσότ. τ. φρ., and connecting τὴν ἔχθραν with καταργήσας.

[10] Vorstius, Grotius, Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Meier, and others.

[11] *Paries intergerinus*, found elsewhere

Ver. 15. *Τὴν ἔχθραν*] This, still included in dependence upon *λύσας*, is now the *μεσότοιχον* broken down by Christ: (namely) the *enmity*. It is, after the example of Theodoret,[7] understood by the majority[8] of the *Mosaic law* as the *cause of the enmity* between Jew and Gentile, in which case the moral law is by some included, by others excluded. But, in accordance with ver. 14, the reader is led to nothing else than the opposite of *εἰρήνη*, *i.e.*, to the abstract *enmity;* and in the sequel, indeed, the abolition of the law is very definitely distinguished from the destruction of the enmity (as means from end). Hence the only mode of taking it, in harmony with the word itself and with the context, is: *the enmity which existed between Jews and the Gentile*s, comp. ver. 16. So Erasmus, Vatablus, Estius, Cornelius à Lapide, Bengel, and others, including Rückert and Bleek; while Hofmann turns the notion of *ἔχθρα* into the mere *ἀπαλλοτρίωσις* of ver. 12, and, refer-

---

only in Eratosthenes quoted by Athen. vii. p. 281 D, in Hesychius under *κατῆλιψ*, and in the Fathers. In Athen. *l.c.* it is *masculine:* *τὸν τῆς ἡδονῆς καὶ ἀρετῆς μεσότοιχον.*

[1] Josephus, *Bell.* v. 5. 2, vi. 2. 4; *Antt.* viii. 3. 2 f., xv. 11. 5, *al.; Middoth*, ii. 3. So Anselm, Ludov. Cappellus, Hammond, Bengel, Wetstein, Krebs, Bretschneider, Holzhausen, and others.

[2] Schöttgen and others.

[3] Wetstein, *ad Joh.* ii. 19.

[4] See Wetstein *in loc.*

[5] See Schwegler, *l.c.* p. 389 f.

[6] Baur.

[7] Comp. *τινές* in Chrysostom.

[8] Including Luther, Calvin, Bucer, Clarius, Grotius, Calovius, Morus, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Meier, Holzhausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette.

ring it to the estrangement on the part of the Gentiles towards the theocracy hated by them, removes the distinctive mark of reciprocity demanded by the context. Quite erroneously, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and lately Harless, hold that the enmity of the Jews and Gentiles *towards God* is meant. In accordance with the context, ver. 14, the μεσότοιχον can, in fact, only be one separating the Jews and Gentiles *from each other*, and not something which separates both *from God;* and how mistaken is such a view also on account of what follows! for the Mosaic law might be conceived of as producing enmity towards God so far doubtless as the *Jews* are concerned (1 Cor. xv. 56; Rom. v. 20, vii. 13; Gal. iii. 19), but never as respects the Gentiles, who stood aloof from all relation to the Mosaic law (Rom. ii. 12). [See Note XXIV., p. 401.] — ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ] does not belong to τὴν ἔχθραν (as Lachmann [and Westcott and Hort] also punctuates it) so that "the national hatred in His people" would be meant;[1] nor yet to λύσας,[2] because in that case this mention of the death of Jesus would be irrelevantly dissevered from the modal definition τὸν νόμον καταργήσας, to which, in the nature of the case, it belongs as an essential element; but it stands with an emphasis suitable to the context (comp. αὐτὸς γάρ, ver. 14) at the head of the specification that now follows, *in what way* Christ has effected what was said in ver. 14 by αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν . . . ἔχθραν: *so that He by His flesh has done away with the law*, namely, when He allowed His flesh to be crucified (Col. i. 21 f.), dissolved thereby the tie with the law that brought men under curse (see on Gal. iii. 13), and thus opened up the justification through faith (Rom. iii. 21 ff.), whereby the institution of the law was emptied of its binding power (comp. Rom. x. 4 ff. vii. 1 ff.; Col. ii. 14). The *moral* commands also of the law had thereby, while not ceasing to be valid, ceased to be held *as constituent elements of the law-institute as such justifying in the way of compliance with it;* and its fulfilment, and that in augmented power, now proceeds from the new vital principle of faith (Rom. viii. 4), on which account Christ, although He is the end of the law (Rom. x. 4; comp. 2 Cor. iii. 11), could nevertheless say that He had come to fulfil the law (Matt. v. 17), and Paul could assert: νόμον ἱστῶμεν, Rom. iii. 31. Hofmann imports into the ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ the thought: in and with the doing away of His life in the flesh, *in respect of which He was an Israelite*, Christ has rendered the appertaining to His community independent of the religious-legal status of an Israelite. As though the *atoning* death of Christ, in the usual *dogmatic* sense of the apostle, had not been most distinctly indicated already before by the ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ver. 13, as afterwards by the ἀποκαταλλάξῃ κ.τ.λ., ver. 16, and by the προσαγωγή, ver. 18! This meaning is not here, any more than at Col. i. 21 f., to be exegetically modified or explained away. — τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι] *to be taken together*, yet not in such a way that ἐν stands for σύν[3] or καί,[4] but as: *the law of the commandments consisting in injunctions*, whereby the *dictatorial* character of the legal institute (as a whole, not merely partially, as Schenkel imports) is exhibited. The genitive τῶν ἐντολῶν denotes the *contents* of the law, and ἐν δόγμασι the essential *form* in which the ἐντολαί are given. The connecting link of the article (τῶν) before ἐν δόγμασι was not requisite, since we may correctly say : ἐντέλλεσθαί τι ἐν δόγματι or ἐντολὴν διδόναι ἐν δόγματί, and therefore ἐντολὴν ἐν δόγματι may be conjoined so as to form *one* conception.[1] Comp. on iii. 13; Rom. vi. 4; Gal. iv. 14, iii. 26. This view of the connection is adopted, after the precedent of many older expositors, by Rückert, Matthies, Meier, Winer, pp. 123, 197, Bisping, Schenkel, Bleek [Ewald, Opitz, Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.*].[2] If one should [3] refer ἐν δόγμ. to καταργήσας, there would result—even apart from the fact that with our mode of connecting ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, this construction is not even possible—the wholly untrue and un-Pauline thought that *Christ has through injunctions abolished the law.* No doubt some have imputed to ἐν δόγμασι the sense *praecepta stabiliendo*, "by establishing the precept,"[4] in doing which they had in view the evangelical doctrine of faith and the *gratia universalis.*[5] But even thus the sense remains untrue and un-Pauline, seeing that the doing away of the law has taken place not at all in a doctrinal way, but *by the fact of the death of Christ* (Rom. vii. 1 f.; Gal. iii. 13; Col. ii. 14). And what a change would be made in the meaning of the word δόγμα, which in the N. T. signifies throughout nothing else than *injunction* (Col. ii. 4 ; Luke ii. 1 ; Acts xvii. 7, xvi. 4 ; comp. Plat. *Legg.* i. p. 644 D ; Xen. *Anab.* iii. 3. 5, vi. 6. 8 ; Dem. 774. 19 ; Herodian, i. 7. 6 ; 4 Macc. iv. 23 f.) ! The distinction ought not to have been overlooked between ἐντολή and δόγμα, which latter puts the meaning of the former into the more definite form of the enjoining *decree.* A peculiar view is taken by Harless[6] likewise connecting ἐν δόγμ. with καταργήσας, and holding that ἐν denotes the "side on which that efficacy of the death of Christ exerts itself ;" Christ did not render the law ineffectual in any such capacity as σκιὰν τῶν μελλόντων, or as παιδαγωγὸν εἰς Χριστόν, "a shadow of things to come," or "as a schoolmaster unto Christ," but *on the side of the δόγματα.*[7] Incorrectly, because δόγμασι must of necessity have had *the article*, and because it is nowhere taught that the law is done away only *in a single respect.*

---

[1] Chrysostom, Bugenhagen, Schulthess, *Engelwelt*, p. 193.

[2] Oecumenius, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Rückert, and others.

[3] Flatt.

[4] Koppe, Rosenmüller.

---

[1] There is consequently no need whatever for the evasive view of Theile (in Winer's *Exeget. Stud.* I. p. 188 ff.), which is arbitrary and makes the meaning of the expression simply ambiguous, that Paul has not added the article, because ἐν δόγμ. is to be conceived of in the like relation to τὸν νόμον as to τῶν ἐντολῶν.

[2] Several of the older expositors, nevertheless, explained : *legem mandatorum in decretis sitam*, "the law of commandments fixed in decrees" (Erasmus, comp. Castalio, Beza, Calvin, and others), so that they connected ἐν δόγμ. with τὸν νόμον. But in that case τόν must of necessity have stood before ἐν δόγμ. And to excuse the absence of the article "*ob congeriem articulorum*," "on account of the accumulation of articles" (Erasmus), is arbitrary. How often have classical writers accumulated articles ! Plato, *Phileb.* p. 33 A ; Dem. *Ol.* iii. 11, and many others. They avoid only the coming together of the same article, *e.g.* τὸ τό (Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* pp. 332 C, 598 B). Comp. also Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 80 [E. T. 92].

[3] With the Syriac, Arabic, Vulgate, Pelagius, Chrysostom, and his successors, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Grotius, Estius, Bengel, Holzhausen, and others, including Fritzsche, *Diss. in 2 Cor.* ii. p. 168 f.

[4] Fritzsche.

[5] See Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Theophylact, Estius, Bengel, and others.

[6] Followed by Olshausen.

[7] "In reference to the commanding form of its precepts," Olshausen.

The Mosaic legal institute *as such*, and not merely from a certain side, has in Christ its end (Rom. x. 4); the *σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων*, "shadow of things to come," in the law has only a transient typical destination (see on Col. ii. 17), and the work of the *παιδαγωγός*, "schoolmaster," is at an end with the attainment of maturity on the part of his pupils (Gal. iii. 24 f.). Incorrect also is the view of Hofmann, p. 377, who, likewise taking *ἐν δόγμασι* as modal definition to *καταργήσας*, and for the expression with *ἐν* comparing 1 Cor. ii. 7, finds the meaning: by the very fact that Christ has put an end to *precepts generally*, He has invalidated the O. T. law of commandments. The statement that Christ has put an end to *δόγματα generally*, i.e., *to commanding precepts in general*, is at variance with the whole N. T., which contains numberless definite commands, and, in particular, with the teaching of Paul, who even places Christianity as a whole under the point of view, Rom. iii. 27, ix. 31, Gal. vi. 2, 1 Cor. ix. 21, of a *νόμος* (which, without *δόγματα*, is not at all conceivable [1]), and specially with Col. ii. 14. Paul would at least have made a limiting addition to *ἐν δόγμασι*, and have written something like *ἐν δόγμασι δουλείας* (comp. Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 24, v. 1). — *ἵνα τοὺς δύο . . . εἰρήνην*] a statement of the object aimed at in the just expressed abrogation of the law, which statement of aim corresponds to what has been said concerning Christ in ver. 14, more precisely defining and confirming the same. Harless arbitrarily passes over what immediately precedes, and holds that *ἵνα . . . εἰρήνην* expresses the design of *ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἕν*, in which case too, we may add, there would result a tautological relation of the thought. — *τοὺς δύο*] The Jews and Gentiles, who before were designated in accordance with the general category under a *neuter* form, are here conceived of *concretely* as the two *men* under discussion, of whom the one is the totality of the Jews, and the other that of the Gentiles, out of which two men Christ has made a single new man. This is the collective subject of the *καινὴ κτίσις*, Gal. vi. 15 (the whole body of Christians). — *ἐν ἑαυτῷ*] is neither, with Grotius, to be taken as: *per doctrinam suam*, "by his doctrine," nor, with Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and others, as equivalent to *δι' ἑαυτοῦ*, "by himself," [2] but it affirms that the unity to be brought about out of the two by the new creation was to be founded *in Christ Himself*, that is, was to have the basis of its existence and continuance in Him, and not in any other unifying principle whatever. In the case, namely, of all individuals, from among the Jews and Gentiles, who form the *one* new man, the death of Christ is that, wherein this new unity has its causal basis; without the death of the cross it would not exist, but, on the contrary, the two would still be just in the old duality and separation as the Jew and the Greek. Calvin well remarks that *in se ipso*, "in himself," is added "ne alibi quam in Christo unitatem quaerant," "that they should not seek unity elsewhere than in Christ." Comp. Gal. iii. 28. [See Note XXV., p. 401.] This union, negatively conditioned by the abolition of the law, and having its basis in the self-sacrifice of Christ, is positively accomplished *as regards*

---

[1] The *δόγματα* of Christianity are the true *ἀεὶ παρόντα δόγματα*, "always present decrees," Plato, *Theaet.* p. 158 D.

[2] Oecumenius: *οὐ δι' ἀγγέλων ἢ ἄλλων τινῶν δυνάμεων*, "neither through angels nor any other powers."

the subjects through the Spirit, 1 Cor. xii. 13. Comp. subsequently ver. 18. But *objectively* accomplished—namely, as a fact before God and apart from the subjective appropriation by means of the Spirit—it is already by virtue of the death, which Christ has undergone for the reconciliation of both parties, Jews and Gentiles, with God; see ver. 16. — *καινόν*] For this *one* is now neither Jew nor Greek, which the two, out of which the *one* has been made, previously were; but both portions have laid aside their former religious and moral attitude, and without further distinction have obtained the quite new nature conditioned by Christian faith. Is *καινόν* had not been added, *εἷς ἄνθρωπος* might be incorrectly conceived of as an amalgam of Jew and Gentile. To exclude, we may add, from *καινόν* the *moral* element[1] is not merely arbitrary, but, according to the apostolic way of looking at matters, even impossible, 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. iv. 27, vi. 14 f., v. 6. — *ποιῶν εἰρήνην*] *Present* participle, because the establishment of peace as what was duly to set in with the designed new creation, was implied in the very scope thereof; it was that which was to be brought about *in and with it*. Observe that *ποιῶν εἰρήνην* is spoken from the standpoint of the *design* expressed in *ἵνα τοὺς δύο κ.τ.λ.*, and is included as belonging to what is *designed;* consequently: *so that He* (by this new creation) *makes peace* (not *made* peace). *εἰρήνη* is, in accordance with the context, the opposite of *ἔχθρα*, ver. 15, consequently peace of the two portions *with each other*, not: *with God*,[2] nor: *πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους*, "*with God and with one another.*"[3]

Ver. 16. Continuation of the sentence expressive of the design. Christ has by His death done away with the law, in order to make the Jew and the Gentile into one new man (ver. 15), *and* (and consequently) *so to accomplish the reconciliation of both with God, that they should as one body be reconciled with God through the cross, after He has slain thereon the enmity which hitherto existed between them.* — *καί*] is the *and* of the sequence of thought; from what was before said resulted *the way and manner* of the reconciliation of the two with God; hence also *ἀποκαταλλ.* is *prefixed.* — *ἀποκαταλλάσσω*, only here and Col. i. 20; in the other Greek writings only *καταλλάσσω* is preserved, which is *not* distinguished from *διαλλάσσω*.[4] The composition with *ἀπό* may, after the analogy of other compounds with *ἀπό* (comp. *ἀποκαθίστημι*, *ἀποκατορθόω*, *al.*), denote *again;*[5] but it may also (comp. *ἀποθαυμάζω*, *ἀποθεραπεύω*, *al.*), *strengthen* the notion of the reconciliation. The latter is better adapted to the context (*ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι*; and see ver. 18). In opposition to Hofmann's conversion of the notion into that of the restoration of fellowship with God, see on Col. i. 20. We may add that *ἀποκαταλλ* does not apply to the *mutual* reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles,[6] but, as the express *τῷ Θεῷ* says (Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18, 20), to the reconciliation of both *with God*, whose wrath, namely, against sinners Christ has by His ἱλαστήριον changed into grace. Comp. on Col. i. 21 ; 2 Cor. v. 18 ; Rom. v. 10. — τοὺς ἀμϑοτέρους] not again τοὺς δύο, because they are now conceived as *united*, comp. vv. 14, 18. — ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι] is held by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Beza, Calovius, Calixtus, Wolf, Bengel, Zachariae, Koppe, Flatt, Rückert, Matthies, Harless, Hofmann, Lechler, and others, to be the body of *Christ ;* by the offering up of *one* body *both* are reconciled with God. But how superfluous in that case would the διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ be ![1] Moreover, *Christ* is in fact the subject, and how could it be said of *Christ* that by a single body He has reconciled both with God, or—as Hofmann gives to the meaning a turn quite departing from the N. T. and especially the Pauline doctrine of atonement—that He has made a single body (*His* body, namely) to be their unity embracing them in the like fellowship of God,[2] since in fact the case of a plurality of bodies on the part of *Christ* was not even as an abstraction conceivable ? This inappropriateness, hardly excusable by the reference to τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους and not removed by the pure invention of a contrast to the many bodies offered up under the O. T.,[3] would only cease to be felt, if God were the subject, so that Paul might say that *God* had by the surrender of *one* body reconciled *the two* (2 Cor. v. 18 ; Col. i. 21) with Himself. Hence Ambrosiaster, Oecumenius, Photius, Anselm, Erasmus, Bucer, Calvin, Piscator, Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Grotius, Michaelis, Morus, and others, including Meier, Holzhausen, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Winer, Bleek, have rightly found in ἓν σῶμα the *unum corpus*, "one body," which is formed of the Jews and Gentiles united into a εἷς καινὸς ἄνθρωπος. Comp. on ἓν σῶυα, Rom. v. 12 ; 1 Cor. x. 17 ; Eph. iv. 4 ; Col. iii. 15. Christ has reconciled the two *in one body*, *i.e.*, constituting one body without further separation—the two portions of humanity *as one whole*—unto God. How entirely is this mode of taking it in keeping with the whole context ! See especially vv. 14, 15. — ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ] *after he shall have slain*, etc. ; for it is inserted in the second half of the affirmation of *design* which begins with the ἵνα of ver. 15, so that it is correlative to the ποιῶν εἰρήνην of the first half. On ἀποκτ. Grotius correctly observes : "idem hic valet, quod modo λύσας, sed crucis facta mentione, aptior fuit translatio verbi ἀποκτείνας, quia crux mortem adfert," "Here the same applies as above to λύσας, but when mention of the cross is made, the use of the word ἀποκτείνας is more fitting, because the cross brings death." And the ἐχϑρα (here personified) is not to be explained otherwise than in ver. 14; hence not the *law*,[1] nor the hostile relation of the Jews and Gentiles towards *God*,[2] but the enmity of the two *towards each other*. The aim of the apostle was not to explain the nature of the atonement in general as such, but to show how Christ has reconciled with God the Jews and Gentiles *combined into unity*, and to this end it was pertinent to say that He had cancelled the enmity which had hitherto subsisted between them. The *aorist participle*, we may add, affirms not something simultaneous with ἀποκαταλλ. (*ita ut interficeret*, "so that he might slay," but something *preceding* (*after that* He has slain), so that the *relation of time* is conceived of otherwise than in the case of the correlative ποιῶν εἰρήνην, ver. 15. Paul, namely, has conceived the matter thus: Christ has desired by His death on the cross to cancel the mutual enmity between Jews and Gentiles (see on ver. 15), and then by means of this death to reconcile both, who should now in this manner be united into one aggregate, ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι with God. In reality these are indeed only different *sides* of the effect of the death of Christ on the cross, not separate and successive effects; but in the representation unfolding the subject, in which Paul will here, as in a picture, set the matter before us in its various elements, they appear so, and this is in keeping with the whole solemn pathos which is shed over the passage. — ἐν αὐτῷ] *i.e.*, *on the cross*. The reference to σώματι[3] falls with the correct explanation of ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι. The reading ἐν ἑαυτῷ (F G, 115, codd. in Jer. Arab. pol. Vulg. It. Goth. Syr. p. Ambr. Aug.) would yield the same sense as that reference to σώματι, but is a conformation to ver. 15, in accordance with which Luther also translated "*through Himself*."

---

[1] Meier, comp. Rückert.

[2] Harless.

[3] Chrysostom, Oecumenius.

[4] In opposition to Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 101; see Fritzsché, *ad Rom.* I. p. 276 ff.

[5] Calvin: "*reduxerit* in unum gregem," "He brought again into one flock," also Harless [and Cremer, Wörterbuch].

[6] Grotius, according to whom *τῷ Θεῷ* is then equivalent to *ut Deo serviant!* "that they may serve God."

---

[1] Hofmann, after Tertull. *c. Marc.* v. 17, attaches it to the following ἀποκτ., by which, however, the emphasis that manifestly lies on ἀποκτ. is pushed forward to διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ.

[2] "In His person subsists the newness of human nature for them, and in His body, wherein [as a bodily living man] He has gone unto God, they have the place where mankind is restored to communion with God," Hofmann, p. 380. With this explaining away of the atonement it was no doubt consistent to connect διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ with ἀποκτ., and to refer back ἐν αὐτῷ to the ἓν σῶμα. The simply correct rendering is given, *e.g.*, in the version of Castalio : "*ut in sese ex duobus conderet unum novum hominem faciendo pacem*, *et ambos uno in corpore reconciliaret Deo per crucem peremtis in ea inimicitiis*," "that in Himself He might produce one new man by making peace, and that He might reconcile both in one body to God by means of the cross, the enmity being removed in it."

[3] Calovius.

Ver. 17. After Christ has established peace, He has come and has also *proclaimed* it, to the Gentiles and the Jews. This proclamation, namely, cannot be regarded as *preceding* the fact by which the peace was established, so that ἐλθών would apply to the *bodily advent of Christ upon earth*,[4] and the connection with ver. 14 would be: "Christ is peace in *deed* (ver. 14) and *word* (ver. 17); He not only *is* peace, but He *proclaimed* it Himself at His appearing on earth," Harless. For, when it is said in ver. 14, αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, the time thought of is, as vv. 14–16 show, the time *after the crucifixion of Christ*, through which and since which He is our peace, so that καὶ ἐλθὼν κ.τ.λ. does not merely attach itself to αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν and leave all that intervenes out of view; but, on the contrary, this intervening matter is so essentially bound up with αὐτὸς γ. ἐ. ἡ εἰρ. ἡμ., that now καὶ ἐλθὼν κ.τ.λ. can introduce not a πρότερον, but only a ὕστερον of the crucifixion, annexing as it does the *further* course of the matter. Rightly, therefore, most expositors have understood in ἐλθών an advent *following the crucifixion of Christ*, in connection with which either the *resurrection* of Christ has been thought of,[5] or His having come *in His spirit*,[6] or in the preaching that took place through *the apostles* (so most), in which latter view ἐλθών is wrongly by many, as Raphel, Grotius, Wolf, Zachariae, Koppe, Rosenmüller,[1] regarded as without significance ; it is in truth an "insigne verbum," "a remarkable word," Bengel. The correct explanation (comp. ver. 18) is given by Olshausen.[2] In the Holy Spirit, namely, not only according to John (John xiv. 18, *al.*), but also according to Paul, *Christ Himself* has come (in so far as it is *Christ's* Spirit) from heaven to those who have received the Spirit, and dwells and rules in them (Rom. viii. 9, 10 ; 2 Cor. iii. 17, xiii. 5 ; Gal. ii. 20), and this *proclamation* has taken place at the instance of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 16), and through the Spirit Himself (Rom. xv. 18 ; comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 3). The *point of time* expressed by εὐηγγελίσατο is the *conversion* of the persons concerned, at which they received the Spirit (Gal. iii. 2 ; Eph. i. 13). Accordingly, the apostle could, without writing at variance with history, name first the readers as original Gentiles (ὑμῖν τοῖς μακράν), and then the Jews ; for when the Ephesians became Christians, there had already long since been converted not merely *Jews*, but Gentiles *and* Jews. Had he, on the other hand, meant the actual coming of Christ upon earth and His oral preaching, the historical necessity would have presented itself of mentioning *first* those that were near and *then* those that were afar off. — We may add that the concrete and vividly depicting expression ἐλθὼν εὐηγγ. can the less occasion surprise, as the whole passage bears a pathetic impress. Comp. also Acts xxvi. 23. — εἰρήνην has been, from the time of Chrysostom, ordinarily explained of peace *with God*, while only a few, as Estius and Koppe, suppose peace *with each other* to be *included ;* but Olshausen rightly understands the latter *alone*, as does also Bleek. Only this is in keeping with the whole connection (see, moreover, the immediately preceding ἀποκτ. τὴν ἔχθραν, and comp. ver. 19), and, moreover, has ver. 18 not against it, but in its favor (see on ver. 18).— ὑμῖν τοῖς μακράν and τοῖς ἐγγύς] (both to be explained in accordance with ver. 12, and comp. Isa. lvii. 19) are dependent on εὐηγγελίσατο,—the view which immediately and most naturally suggests itself. Harless would attach both very closely to εἰρήνην,—a course to which he was impelled by his explanation of ἐλθὼν εὐηγγ., in order not to present the apostle as saying what is inconsistent with history (Matt. xv. 24, comp. x. 5 f. ; John x. 16 ; Matt. xxi. 43, *al.*). But the inconsistency with history would still remain.[3]—The *repetition* of εἰρήνην (see the critical remarks) has rhetorical emphasis, John xiv. 27 ; Buttm. *neut. Gr.* p. 341 [E. T. 398]. This ἐπιμονή of the expression, however,[4] excludes the view of Wieseler, p. 444, that τοῖς ἐγγύς also is in apposition to ὑμῖν, and means specially the Jewish-Christians in *Ephesus.*

---

[1] Michaelis, Koppe, Holzhausen.

[2] Most expositors, including Rückert, Meier, Harless, Hofmann.

[3] Bengel, Semler, Hofmann, following Tertullian.

[4] Chrysostom, Anselm, Estius, Holzhausen, Matthies, Harless.

[5] Bengel, Rückert.

[6] Olshausen.

---

[1] Comp. Meier.

[2] Comp. Baumgarten-Crusius and de Wette, also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 475, and Bleek.

[3] If Paul had understood ἐλθ. εὐηγγ. in the sense of Harless, he must at all events have written εἰρ. τοῖς ἐγγὺς κ. εἰρ. ὑμῖν τοῖς μακράν. Harless himself has paraphrased (comp. Erasm. *Paraphr.*) : "The contents of his message was a peace which availed for all, *Jews as well as Gentiles.*" Evidently under an involuntary sense of the historical relation, but in opposition to the words, according to which Harless ought to have paraphrased ; "availed for all, *Gentiles as well as Jews.*"

[4] Nägelsbach on Hom. *Il.* i. 436.

Ver. 18. *Proof from an appeal to fact* for what has just been said : εὐηγγ. εἰρήνην ὑμῖν τ. μακρ. κ. εἰρ. τοῖς ἐγγύς. In this case the main stress of the proof lies in οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύμ. If, namely, through Christ, *both in One Spirit* have the προσαγωγή to the Father, to both must the *same* news, that of *peace*, have been imparted by Him. This is the necessary historic premiss of that happy state of unity now actually subsistent through Christ. He must have proclaimed εἰρήνη to the one as to the other ; of this Paul now gives the *probatio ab effectu*, "proof from the effect." Others hold that ὅτι introduces *the contents* of the message of peace.[1] But the *contents* are fully expressed in the εἰρήνη itself, agreeably to the context ; hence, too, we may not say, with Rückert, that the *essence* of the εἰρήνη is explained. According to Harless, the *truth of that proclamation* is shown from the *reality of the possession*. But in this way a subsidiary thought (namely, that the proclamation was *true*) is introduced not merely arbitrarily, but also unsuitably (for the *truth* of that which has been proclaimed was self-evident). — τὴν προσαγωγήν] Christ is not conceived of as *door*,[2] which is remote from the context, but as *bringer ;* in which case there may be an allusion to the Oriental custom of getting access to the king only through a προσαγωγεύς (see on Rom. v. 2), but not to *sacrificial processions* in accordance with Herod. ii. 58,[3] which would be an unsuitable comparison. Before Christ had reconciled men with God, communion with God was, on account of the wrath of God (ver. 3 ; Rom. v. 10), denied to them ; Christ by His ἱλαστήριον removed this obstacle, and thus became the προσαγωγεύς, through the mediation of whom (δι αὐτοῦ) we now and henceforth have the *bringing near*[4] unto God. In substance the having the προσαγωγή to God is not different from the εἰρήνη πρὸς τὸν Θεόν (Rom. v. 1), and from the filial relationship of the reconciled. It is the consequence of the atoning death of Jesus; the peaceful relation of believers towards God, brought about through this death. Comp. 1 Pet. iii. 18. Here, moreover, as at Rom. v. 2, the notion of *bringing towards*, which the world has, is not to be interchanged with that of *approach* or *access*,[5] as though πρόσοδον were written in the text. Christ by the continuous power and efficacy of His atoning act is the constant *Bringer* to the Father. Comp. iii. 12. — ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι] for the *Holy Spirit* is to both one and the same element of life (comp. on Rom. viii. 15), apart from which they cannot have the προσαγωγή to God. The referring of it to the *human* spirit[6] ought to have been precluded by taking note of the Divine *Trias* in our passage (δι' αὐτοῦ, ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι, πρὸς τὸν πατέρα); comp. vv. 12, 22. — Observe, further, the difference of meaning between the ἔχομεν (denoting the continuously present possession of the signal benefit) and the ἐσχήκαμεν of Rom. v. 2 (see on the latter passage).

Ver. 19. Ἄρα οὖν] draws the inference from vv. 14–18 ; and this inference is the same in its tenor with what was said at ver. 13, but is carried out in more detail; for this is just what was to be proved ver. 14 ff., — *ξένοι*] *i.e.*, such as *are not included as belonging to the theocracy*, but are related towards it as *strangers*, who belong to another state; the opposite is *συμπολῖται τῶν ἁγίων*. Comp. ver. 12. The same is indicated by *πάροικοι*: *inquilini*,[1] *i.e.*, those who, coming from elsewhere, sojourn in a land or city without having the right of citizenship (Acts vii. 6, 29; 1 Pet. ii. 11).[2] It is the same as is expressed in classic Greek by *μέτοικοι*,[3] in contradistinction to the *πολίτης* or *ἀστός*.[4] [See Note XXVI., p. 401.] The Gentiles are in the commonwealth of God only *inquilini*, *sojourners*, not citizens; they have no *πολιτεία* therein; although they are ruled by God (Rom. iii. 29) and included in the Messianic promise (Rom. iv. 12 f.), they are so in the second place (Rom. i. 16), and without participating in the time-hallowed peculiar prerogatives of the Israelites (Rom. iii. 1, ix. 4 ff). The referring of *πάροικοι* to the conception of a *household* (persons pertaining to the house, members of the family) is not to be made good by linguistic usage (not even by Lev. xxii. 10), and is not demanded by the antithesis of *οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ*,[5] inasmuch as *οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ* sustains a *climactic relation* to the preceding *συμπολ. τῶν ἁγίων*, and the two *together* form the contrast to *ξένοι and πάροικοι*. The reference to the *proselytes*[6] is quite at variance with the context (vv. 11–13). — *ἀλλ' ἐστέ*] emphatic repetition of the verb after *ἀλλά*. Comp. Rom. viii. 15; 1 Cor. ii. 8; Heb. xii. 18 ff. — *συμπολῖται*] belongs to the inferior Greek; Lucian, *Soloec.* 5; Ael. *V. H.* iii. 44; Joseph. *Antt.* xix. 2. 2.[7] — *τῶν ἁγίων*] *i.e.*, of those who constitute the people of God. These were formerly the Jews (ver. 12), into whose place, however, the *Christians* have entered as the Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ Θεοῦ (Gal. vi. 16), as the true descendants of Abraham (Rom. iv. 10 ff.) and God's people (Rom. ix. 5 ff.), acquired as His property by the work of Christ (see on ix. 14). The Ephesians have thus, by becoming Christians, attained to the fellow-citizenship with the saints,—which saints the *Christians* were,—so that *τῶν ἁγίων* does not embrace either the *Jews*[8] or the *patriarchs*,[9] with whom even the *angels* have been associated.[10] — *οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ*] *members of God's household*. The theocracy is thought of as a *family*, dwelling in a house, of which God is the *οἰκοδεσπότης*. 1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 2, 5, 6, x. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 17. Comp. בית יהוה, Num. xii. 7; Hos. viii. 1. Harless: belonging to the house of God, *as the building-stones of the house, in which God dwells*. But thus the *following* figure is *anticipated*, and that in a way contrary to the meaning of οἰκεῖος; and an incongruous contrast is afforded to the πάροικοι.

---

[1] Baumgarten, Koppe, Morus, Flatt.

[2] John x. 7 ; Beza, Calvin.

[3] Meier.

[4] Thuc. i. 82; Polyb. ix. 41. 1, xii. 4. 10; Xen. *Cyr.* vii. 5. 45.

[5] As still by Rückert, Harless, Bleek.

[6] ὁμοθυμαδόν, "with one accord," Anselm, Homberg, Zachariae, Koppe, Morus, Rosenmüller.

---

[1] Among Greek writers *πάροικος* has not this signification, but is equivalent to *neighbor*; it has it, however, in the LXX. (Ex. xii. 45; Lev. xxv. 6–23). Comp. *παροικία*, Acts xiii. 17, and in the LXX.; Clem. *Cor.* ii. 5.

[2] See, in general, Wetstein, *ad Luc.* xxiv. 18; Gesen. *Thes. s.v.* תוֹשָׁב.

[3] Wolf, *prol. Dem. Lept.* p. lxvi. ff.; Hermann, *Staatsalterth.* § 115.

[4] Plat. *Pol.* viii. p. 563 A, *al.*

[5] In opposition to Bengel, Koppe, Flatt, Meier, Harless, Olshausen, Schenkel.

[6] Anselm, Whitby, Cornelius à Lapide, Calixtus, Baumgarten.

[7] See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 172.

[8] Vorstius, Hammond, Bengel, Morus.

[9] Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, and others; Theodoret: *ἁγίους ἐνταῦθα οὐ μόνον τοὺς τῆς χάριτος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἐν νόμῳ καὶ τοὺς πρὸ νόμου λεγει*, "Here by saints he refers not only to those of grace, but also to those of the law and before the law."

[10] Calvin, Flatt.

Ver. 20. The conception οἶκος Θεοῦ leads the apostle, in keeping with the many-sided versatility of his association of ideas, to make the transition from the figure of a household-*fellowship*, to the figure of a house-*structure*, and accordingly to give to οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ a further illustration, which now is no longer appropriate to the *former* figurative conception, but only to the *latter*, which, however, was not yet expressed in οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ. Comp. Col. ii. 6, 7. — ἐποικοδομηθέντες] namely, when ye became Christians. The *compound* does not stand for the *simple* term,[1] but denotes the building *up*. Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 10, 12, 14; Col. ii. 7; Xen. *Hist.* vi. 5. 12; Dem. 1278. 27. ἐπί, *with the dative*, however,[2] is not here occasioned by the *aorist* participle,[3] which would not have hindered the use either of the genitive[4] or of the accusative (1 Cor. iii. 12; Rom. xv. 20); but the *accusative* is not employed, because Paul has not in his mind the relation of direction, and it is purely accidental that not the *genitive* of rest, but the *dative* of rest is employed. [See Note XXVII., p. 402.] — τῶν ἀποστ. κ. προφ.] is taken by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Estius, Morus, and others, including Meier, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, as genitive of *apposition;* but wrongly, since the apostles and prophets *are* not the foundation, but have *laid* it (1 Cor. iii. 10). *The foundation laid by the apostles and prophets*[5] is the gospel of Christ, which they have proclaimed, and by which they have established the churches; see on 1 Cor. iii. 10. "Testimonium apost. et proph. substructum est fidei credentium omnium," "The testimony of the apostles and prophets is the support of the faith of all believers," Bengel. — προφητῶν] has been understood by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Jerome, Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Calovius, Estius, Baumgarten, Michaelis, and others, including Rückert, of the *Old Testament* prophets. That not these, however, but the *New Testament* prophets (see on 1 Cor. xii. 10), are intended,[6] is clear, not indeed from the non-repetition of the article, since the apostles and prophets might be conceived as *one* class,[7] but (1) from the very order of the words,[8] which, especially from the pen of an apostle, would most naturally have been τῶν προφητῶν κ. ἀποστόλων; (2) from the analogy of iii. 5, iv. 11; and (3) from the fact that the foundation-laying in question can, from the nature of the case, only be the preaching of the Christ who *has come*, because upon this foundation the establishment of the church took place, and in that preaching the old prophetic predictions were used only as means (Rom. xvi. 26). Comp. also ver. 21. [See Note XXVIII., p. 402.] Harless supposes that the apostles are here called *at the same time* prophets.[1] In this way, no doubt, the objection of Rückert is obviated, that, in fact, the prophets themselves would have come to Christianity only by means of the apostles, and would themselves have stood only on the ϑεμέλιος τῶν ἀποστόλων; but (*a*) from the non-repetition of the article there by no means follows the unity of the persons (see above), but only the unity of the category, under which the two are thought of. (*b*) There may be urged against it the analogy of iv. 11, as well as that in the whole N. T., where the ecclesiastical functions are already distinguished[2] and *prophets* are mentioned, *apostles* are not at the same time intended. It is true that the apostles had of necessity to possess the gift of prophecy, but this was understood of itself, and they are always called merely *apostles*, while simply those having received the gift of prophecy, who were *not* at the same time apostles, are termed *prophets;* comp. 1 Cor. xii. 28 f. (*c*) There would be no reason whatever bearing on the matter in hand why the apostles should here be designated specially as prophets; nay, the contrast of *Moses and the prophets*, arbitrarily assumed by Hofmann, would only tell *against* the identity (Luke xxiv. 27, 44; Acts xxiv. 14; John i. 46). That objection of Rückert, however, disappears entirely when we contemplate the prophets as the immediate and principal *fellow-laborers* in connection with the laying of the foundation done primarily by the apostles, in which character they, although themselves resting upon the ϑεμέλιον of the apostles, yet in turn were associated with them as founders. And the more highly Paul esteems prophecy (1 Cor. xiv. 1), and puts the prophets elsewhere also in the place next to the apostles (iv. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28 f.), with so much the more justice might he designate the *apostles and prophets* as laying the foundation of the churches; and the less are we warranted, with de Wette, in finding here traces of a *disciple of the apostles*, who has had before him the results of the apostolic labors as well as the period of the original prophecy as concluded, or with Schwegler[3] and Baur (p. 438), in recognizing traces of *Montanism* with its new prophets as the continuers of the apostolate. — ὄντος ἀκρογ. αὐτοῦ Ἰ. Χ.] *wherein Jesus Christ Himself is corner-stone.* On this most essential point, without which the building up in question upon the apostolic and prophetic foundation would lack its uniquely distinctive character, hinges the whole completion of the sublime picture, vv. 21, 22. The gospel preached by the apostles and prophets is the foundation, the basis, upon which the Ephesians were built up, *i.e.*, this apostolic and prophetic gospel was preached also at Ephesus, and the readers were thereby converted and formed into a Christian community; but the *corner-stone* of this building is *Christ Himself*, inasmuch, namely, as Christ, the historic, living Christ, to whom all Christian belief and life have reference, as necessarily conditions through Himself the existence and endurance of each Christian commonwealth, as the existence and steadiness of a building are dependent on the indispensable corner-stone which upholds the whole structure.[1] Only as to the figure, not as to the thing signified, is there a difference when Christ is *here* designated as the *corner-stone*, and at 1 Cor. iii. 11 as the *foundation*. The identity of the matter lies in *τὸν κείμενον*, 1 Cor. *l.c.* See on that passage. In the figure of the *corner-stone* (which "duos parietes ex diverso venientes conjungit et continet," "joins and holds two walls coming from different directions," Estius), many have found the *union of the Jews and Gentiles* set forth.[2] But this is at variance with *πᾶσα οἰκοδ.*, ver. 21, according to which for *every* Christian community, and so also for those consisting *exclusively* of Jewish-Christians or *exclusively* of Gentile-Christians, Christ is the corner-stone. — *αὐτοῦ*] does not apply to *τῷ ϑεμελίῳ*,[3] for Christ is conceived of as the corner-stone, not of the foundation, but of the building (ver. 21). It belongs to *'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, which with this *αὐτοῦ* is placed emphatically at the end, in order then to join on by *ἐν ᾧ κ.τ.λ.* that which is to be further said of Christ, in so far as He is Himself the corner-stone. The article *αὐτοῦ τοῦ* 'I. X. *might* be used; Christ would then be conceived of as already present in the consciousness of the readers:[4] it was not *necessary*, however, to use it;[5] but the conception is: *Christ Himself* is corner-stone;[6] so that *Christ Himself*, as respects His own unique destination in this edifice, is contradistinguished from His laborers, the apostles and prophets.—Whether, it may be asked, is *τῷ ϑεμελίῳ masculine* (see on 1 Cor. iii. 10) or *neuter?* It tells in favor of the former that, with Paul, it is at 1 Cor. iii. 11 (also 2 Tim. ii. 19) decidedly *masculine*, but in no passage decidedly *neuter* (Rom. xv. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 19). Harless erroneously thinks that the neuter is employed by the apostle only metaphorically.

---

[1] Koppe.

[2] Comp. Xen. *Anab.* iii. 4. 11.

[3] Harless.

[4] Hom. *Il.* xxii. 225; Plato, *Legg.* v. p. 736 E.

[5] As most expositors, including Koppe, Flatt, Rückert, Matthies, Harless, Bleek, correctly take it.

[6] Pelagius, Piscator, Grotius, Bengel, Zachariae, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Harless, Meier, Matthies, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Bleek.

[7] Xen. *Anab.* ii. 2. 5: οἱ στρατηγοι καὶ λοχαγοί; comp. Saupp. *ad Xen. Venat.* v. 24; Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 373.

[8] This has been very arbitrarily explained by the assertion that the apostles preached the gospel immediately, that they possessed the greater endowment of grace, that the foundation had been no *recens positum*, "not been one recently fixed," and such like. See specially Calovius and Estius.

---

[1] So also Rückert on iii. 5, and Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 122. The latter adduces as a reason, that προφ. is no peculiar N. T. designation like ἀπόστ. This, however, it surely is, namely, in the N. T. *sense*, for which the O. T. *word* was the most suitable vehicle. Philippi also, *Glaubenslehre*, I. p. 288, ed. 2, declares himself in favor of Harless.

[2] This is not yet the case at Matt. xxiii. 34, where rather the *whole category* of Christian teachers is still designated by Old Testament names. In the parallel Luke xi. 49, on the other hand, the apostles are already adduced as such by name.

[3] In *Zeller's Jahrb.* 1844, p. 379.

Ver. 21. An elucidation to *ὄντος ἀκρογ. αὐτοῦ* 'I. X., bearing on the matter in hand, and placing in yet clearer light the thought of ver. 19 f.: *in whom each congregation, in whom also yours* (ver. 22), *organically develops itself unto its holy destination.*[7] — *ἐν ᾧ*] means neither *by whom*,[8] nor *upon whom*,[9] but: *in whom*, so that Christ (for *ᾧ* applies neither to *ἀκρογ.*, as Castalio, Estius, and Koppe suppose, nor to *τῷ ϑεμελίῳ*, as Holzhausen would have it, but to the nearest and emphatic *αὐτοῦ 'Ιησοῦ* X.) appears as that *wherein* the joining together of the building has its common point of support (comp. i. 10).—*πᾶσα οἰκοδομή*] not: the *whole* building,[1] which would be at variance with linguistic usage, and would absolutely require the reading (on that account preferred by Matthies, Winer, and others) *πᾶσα ἡ οἰκοδομή* (see the critical remarks), but: *every building*. The former interpretation, moreover, the opposition of which to linguistic usage is rightly urged also by Reiche,[2] is by no means logically necessary, since Paul was not *obliged* to proceed from the conception of the *whole* body of Christians to the community of the readers (ver. 22), but might pass equally well from the conception "*every* congregation," to the conception "*also ye*" (ver. 22), and thus subordinate the particular to the general. The objection that there is only *one οἰκοδομή*[3] is baseless, since the collective body of Christians might be just as reasonably, as *every congregation for* itself, conceived as a temple-building. The latter conception is found, as in 1 Cor. iii. 16, so also here, where the former is linguistically *impossible*. Chrysostom, however, is wrong in holding that by *πᾶσα οἰκοδ.* is signified every *part* of the building (wall, roof, etc.), since *οἰκοδομή* rather denotes the *aggregate* of the single parts of the building, the *edifice*, and since not a wall, a roof, etc., but only the building as a whole which is thought of, can grow unto a temple.—*συναρμολ.*] *becoming framed together;* for the *present* participle represents the edifice as still *in the process of building*, as indeed every community is engaged in the progressive developement of its frame of Christian life until the Parousia (comp. on 1 Cor. iii. 15). The participle is closely connected with *ἐν ᾧ*: every building, while its framing together, *i.e.*, the harmonious combination of its parts into the corresponding whole, takes place in Christ, grows, etc. The compound *συναρμολογεῖν* (with classical writers *συναρμόζειν*) is met with only here and iv. 16, but *ἁρμολογεῖν* in Philipp. *Thess.* 78.—*αὔξει*] On this form of the present, read in the N.T. only here and at Col. ii. 19, but genuinely classical, see Matthiae, p. 541.—*εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον*] Final result of this growth. It is not, however, to be translated: unto *a* holy temple, for the conception of *several* temples was foreign to the apostle with his Jewish nationality, but: *unto the* holy temple, in which there was no need of the article (see on 1 Cor. iii. 16). To realize the idea of the *one* temple—that is the goal unto which *every* community, while its organic development of life has its firm support in Christ, groweth up. — ἐν κυρίῳ] By this not *God* is meant, as Michaelis, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Holzhausen, and others suppose, but *Christ* (see the following ἐν ᾧ). By the majority it is connected with ἅγιον, in which case it would not have, with Beza, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, to be taken for the dative, but[1] would have to be explained of the ἁγιότης of the temple, *having its causal ground in Christ*, thus specifically Christian. But the holiness of the temple lies in the dwelling of God therein (see ver. 22); it does not, therefore, *first come into existence* in Christ, but *is* already *existent*, and *the church* becomes in Christ that which the holy temple *is*, inasmuch as in this church the idea of the holy temple realizes itself. Others have rightly, therefore, connected it with αὔξει, although ἐν is not, with Grotius, Wolf, *et al.*, to be translated by *per*. In the case of every building which is framed together in Christ, the growing into the holy temple takes place also *in Christ* (as the one on whom this further development depends). The being framed together and the growing up of the building to its sacred destination—*both* not otherwise than *in the Lord.*

---

[1] On *ἀκρογωνιαῖος, sc. λίθος*, which does not occur in Greek writers, comp. LXX. Isa. xxviii. 16; Symm. Ps. cxvii. 22; 1 Pet. ii. 6; on the subject-matter, Matt. xxi. 42.

[2] Theodoret, Menochius, Estius, Michaelis, Holzhausen, Bretschneider, and others.

[3] Bengel, Cramer, Koppe, Holzhausen, Hofmann, II. 2, p. 122.

[4] *He Himself, Christ;* see Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 117.

[5] In opposition to Bengel.

[6] *Il.* vi. 450; Xen. *Anab.* ii. 1. 5, *Apol.* 11, *al.;* see Bornemann, *ad Anab.* i. 7. 11; Krüger on *Thuc.* i. 27. 3.

[7] Observe the apostle's view of the church, as a whole and in its single parts, as one living *organism.* Comp. Thiersch, *die Kirche im apost. Zeitalt.* p. 154, 162; Ehrenfeuchter, *prakt. Theol.* I. p. 55 ff.

[8] Castalio, Vatablus, Menochius, Morus, and others, including Flatt.

[9] Estius, Koppe, and others.

---

[1] Oecumenius, Harless, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Bleek.

[2] The admissibility of the anarthrous form *πᾶσα οἰκοδομή*, in the sense of "the *whole* building," cannot be at all conceded, since *οἰκοδομή* is neither a proper name, nor to be regarded as equivalent to such. See Winer, p. 101; Buttmann, *neut. Gram.* p. 78 [E. T. 86]. In general *πᾶς* in the sense of *whole* can only be without an article, when the substantive to which it belongs would not need the article even without *πᾶσ* (Krüger, § 50, 11. 9). Hence *πᾶσα οἰκοδ.* can only signify either *every building*, or else *a building utterly*. In the latter sense Chrysostom appears, very unsuitably, no doubt (see above), to have taken it. According to Hofmann, II. 2, p. 123, *πᾶσα οἰκοδ.* is meant to signify "*whatever becomes a constituent part* of a building" (thus also the Gentiles who become Christians). As if *οἰκοδομή* could mean *constituent part* of a building! It signifies, even in Matt. xxiv. 1, Mark xiii. 1 f., *edifice*. And as if *πᾶσα*, *every* part of the building, when in fact only *two* constituent parts, namely Jews and Gentiles, could be thought of, were in harmony with this relation! The rendering is *linguistically* and *logically* incorrect.

[3] de Wette.

Ver. 22. Ἐν ᾧ] applies to ἐν κυρίῳ, and is to be explained quite like ἐν ᾧ in ver. 21. The reference to ναόν[2] appears on account of the immediately preceding ἐν κυρίῳ arbitrary, and, according to the correct apprehension of πᾶσα οἰκοδ., as well as with regard to the following εἰς κατοικητέηριον κ.τ.λ., impossible. — συνοικοδομεῖσθε] is indicative, not *imperative*,[3] against which vv. 19, 20 are decisive,[4] according to which Paul says not what the readers *ought to be*, but what they *are;* hence he, at ver. 22, attaches in symmetrical *relative* construction the relation of the readers to that which subsists in the case of *every* Christian community, ver. 21. The *compound*, however, may mean either: ye are built *along with* (the others), comp. 3 Esdr. v. 68 (συνοικοδομήσωμεν ὑμῖν), so that the church of the readers would be placed in the same category with the other churches (so it is *ordinarily* understood); or: ye are *builded together*, so that σύν relates to the putting together of the single parts of the building.[5] The latter is to be preferred, because the parallelism of vv. 21 and 22 makes the attaching of different senses to the two compounds συναρμολογ. and συνοικοδ. appear groundless. — εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ] *unto the dwelling of God*, quite the same, only with a variation of expression, as before εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον was (comp. Matt. xxiii. 21), and pertaining to συνοικοδ. The supposition of Griesbach and Knapp, that ἐν ᾧ κ. ὑμ. συνοικοδ. is an interpolation, and εἰς κατοικ. κ.τ.λ. still belongs to αὔξει; as, again, the expedient of Koppe and Rückert, that εἰς κατοικ. τοῦ Θεοῦ means, *in order that a dwelling of God may arise;* and finally, the assertion of Harless, that κατοικ. τοῦ Θεοῦ is not identical with the ναὸς ἅγιος, but that the *individual* Christians were so termed because God dwells in them and the *whole* forms a ναὸς ἅγιος,

---

[1] So also de Wette, Hofmann, Bleek.

[2] Calixtus, Rosenmüller, Matthies.

[3] Calvin, Meier.

[4] In and of itself the *relative* clause would not exclude the imperative (in opposition to Hofmann). See, *e.g.*, Soph. *Oed. Col.* 735 (*al.* 731): ὃν μήτ᾽ ὀκνεῖτε, Herod. i. 89. Comp. the familiar οἶσθ᾽ ὃ δρᾶσον, and the imperative often standing after ὥστε.

[5] Comp. Philo, *de praem. et poen.* p. 928 E: οἰκίαν εὖ συνωκοδομημένην κ. συνηρμοσμένην, "a house well-built and put together," comp. Thuc. i. 93. 3; Dio Cass. xxxix. 61.

—are only different forced interpretations, resulting from the linguistically unwarranted explanation of the above πᾶσα οἰκοδομή as the *whole* building. — ἐν πνεύματι] receives from most expositors an *adjectival* turn : "a *spiritual* temple, in opposition to the stone one of the Jews."[1] How arbitrary generally in itself ! how arbitrary, in particular, not to refer ἐν πνεύματι to the *Holy* Spirit ! since we have here, exactly as in ver. 18, the juxtaposition of the Divine Trias, while the context presents nothing whatever to suggest the contrast with a temple of *stone.* Harless :[2] "a dwelling, *which is in the indwelling of the Spirit ;*" and this, forsooth ! is held to mean : "*inasmuch as the Spirit dwells in them, they are a dwelling of God and of Christ.*" But, apart from the fact that of this "*and of Christ*" there is nothing whatever in the text, in this way ἐν πνεύματι, which according to the literal sense could only be the *continens*, "containing," would in fact be made the *contentum !* "that which is contained." From this the very analogies, in themselves inappropriate (because they are *abstracta*, "abstracts"), which Harless employs : χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι, ἀγάπη ἐν πν., "joy in the spirit, love in the spirit," ought to have precluded him. The true view is to connect it not merely with κατοικ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, but with συνοίκοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, and ἐν is *instrumental.* Ye are being builded together unto the dwelling-place of God *by virtue of the Holy Spirit ;* in so far, namely, as the latter dwells in your Christian congregation (see on 1 Cor. iii. 16 ; 2 Cor. vi. 16 f. ; comp. Jas. iv. 5), and thereby the relation of being the temple of God is brought about —a relation, which without this indwelling of the Spirit would not occur, and would not be possible. For the Spirit of God is related to the ideal temple as the *Shechinah* to the actual temple, and is the *conditio sine qua non* of the same. Comp. also Hofmann, who, however, likewise connects ἐν πν. only with κατοικ. τ. Θ. The objections of Harless to the instrumental rendering of ἐν are not valid ; for (*a*) the circumstance that ἐν πνεύματι was placed only *at the end* not only very naturally resulted from the parallelism with ver. 21, seeing that in ver. 21 there is not contained an element corresponding to the ἐν πνεύματι, and consequently this new element is most naturally appended *at the end*, but the position at the close imparts also to the ἐν πνεύμ. an unusual emphasis,[3] comp. also iii. 5 ; and (*b*) the suggestion that πνεῦμα, as the objective medium, must have the article, is incorrect, seeing that πνεῦμα, with or without an article (in accordance with the nature of a proper noun), is the objective Holy Spirit.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

XVI. Ver. 1. ὄντας νεκρούς.

On this view presented by Meyer, Harless remarks : "The supposition of some, that νεκρός here means 'condemned to death,' 'liable to death,' is entirely arbitrary, since it has not the least foundation either in Greek or Hebrew." Ellicott : "The proleptic reference to physical death, viz., '*certo morituri*' (Mey.)

---

[1] Rückert.

[2] Comp. Meier and Matthies.

[3] Kühner, II. p. 625.

seems irreconcilable with the context. The πλούσιος ὢν ἐν ἐλέει, which seems to specify God's mercy in extending His resurrectionary power, would thus lose much of its appropriateness, and the particle καὶ its proper ascensive force." Braune: "Spiritual death alone is spoken of, since God is the source of life (Ps. xxxvi. 10), and without Him men are in the shadow of death (Matt. iv. 16; Luke i. 79; Matt. viii. 22; Luke xv. 24, 32; Rom. vii. 9, 10). Eadie: "Without putting any polemical pressure on the phrase, we may regard it as spiritual death, not liability to death, but actual death . . . The epithet implies: 1. Previous life; 2. Insensibility; 3. Inability." Against the remark of Cremer: "Were we to take νεκρός to denote religious inaction and incapability, we should violate the connection of the passage which treats of the reception of salvation;" we need refer only to the entire argument of the preceding chapter that shows that even man's receptivity for grace proceeds entirely from the divine purpose for his salvation. "The Scriptures teach that man in sins is not only weak and sick, but also entirely dead. As now a man who is physically dead cannot, of his own powers, prepare or adapt himself to obtain again temporal life; so the man who is spiritually dead in sins cannot, of his own strength, adapt or apply himself to the acquisition of spiritual and heavenly righteousness, unless he be delivered and quickened by the Son of God from the death of sin" (Formula of Concord, p. 553).

XVII. Ver. 2. τοῦ ἀέρος.

The discussion of this topic by Harless is very full (p. 143–161), thorough and discriminating, and his conclusion, that the ἀήρ refers to what is neither earth nor heaven, is more plausible than Meyer's supposition that St. Paul drew this conception from a Rabbinical source. "Without venturing to deny that the word may mysteriously intimate a near propinquity of the spirits of evil, it may still be said that the limitation to the physical atmosphere (Meyer) is as precarious in doctrine as the reference to some ideal 'atmosphere belting a death-world' (Eadie), or to the common parlance of mankind (Alford), is too vague and undefined" (Ellicott).

XVIII. Ver. 3. τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς.

On Meyer's discussion, see Eadie: "The same may be said of Meyer's interpretation, 'through the development of natural disposition;' for if that disposition was natural, its very germs must have been in us at our birth, and what is that but innate depravity?" As to the objection "that the word cannot refer to original depravity, because it is only of actual sins that the apostle speaks in the preceding clauses," we may reply with Olshausen, that in this clause actual sins are pointed out in their ultimate foundation "in the inborn sinfulness of each individual by his connection with Adam." Harless: "The φύσις of an individual thing denotes the peculiarity of its being, which is the result of its being, as opposed to every accessory quality; hence φύσει εἶναι or ποιεῖν τι means to be and to do anything by virtue of a state, or an inclination not acquired but inherent." To this Alford adds: "If this be correct, the expression will amount to an assertion on the part of the apostle of the doctrine of original sin. There is from its secondary position no emphasis on φύσει; but its doctrinal force as referring to a fundamental truth otherwise known is not thereby lessened. And it is not for Meyer to argue against this by assuming original sin not to be a Pauline doctrine. If the apostle asserts it here, this place must stand on its own merits, not be wrested to suit an apparent preconceived meaning of other passages . . . It would be easy to show that every one of them (Rom. i. 18, ii. 8, 9, v. 12, vii. 9, xi. 21 ; Gal. ii. 15) is consistent with the doctrine here implied." Ellicott : "It must fairly be said that the unemphatic position of *φύσει* renders it doubtful whether there is any special contrast to *χάριτι*, or any *direct* assertion of the doctrine of Original Sin ; but that the clause contains an *indirect*, and, therefore, even more convincing assertion of that profound truth, it seems impossible to deny." Riddle : "The attitude here taken as respects this fearful fact of a *universal natural state of condemnation* is precisely that which the Scriptures hold towards the question of the existence of God : it is not proved but assumed." To the above it may be added that the interpretation of Rom. xi. 16, 21 ; Gal. ii. 15 ; 1 Cor. vii. 4 ; Matt. xviii. 2 f.; xix. 14 f., indicated by Meyer under (4) and (5), renders the regeneration of those there mentioned impossible, since it makes of them by nature the children of God, and grace is conferred already by generation. The fullest treatment of this passage is in Harless, pp. 165–180.

XIX. Ver. 9. *ἵνα κ.τ.λ.*

The *prima gratia* of the scholastics here mentioned is thus described by Melanchthon, Apology of Aug. Conf., p. 86, § 17 : "The adversaries, not to pass by Christ altogether, require a knowledge of the history concerning Christ, and ascribe to Him, that He has merited for us that a habit be given, or as they say *prima gratia*, which they understand as a habit, inclining us the more readily to love God. . . They imagine that the will can love God ; but nevertheless this habit stimulates it to do the same the more cheerfully," p. 111, § 41. "They err who imagine that he had merited only a *prima gratia*, and that afterward we please God and merit eternal life by our fulfilling of the law."

XX. Ver. 10. *οἷς προετοίμασεν ὁ Θεός.*

"God, *before* we were created in Christ, *made ready* for us, prearranged, prepared a sphere of moral action, or a road, with the intent *that we should walk in it*, and not leave it ; this sphere, this road was *ἔργα ἀγαθά*" (Ellicott). "Though in such works there be no merit, yet faith shows its genuineness by them. In direct antagonism to the Pauline theology is the strange remark of Whitby, 'that these works of righteousness God hath prepared us to walk in are conditions requisite to make faith saving.' . . . Works cannot impart any elements to faith, as they are not of the same nature with it. The saving power of faith consists in its acceptance and continued possession of God's salvation [*i.e.*, Christ's merit.—Ed.]. Works only prove that the faith we have is a saving faith" (Eadie). "The Holy Ghost *in the Ten Commandments* shows the regenerate in what good works 'God hath before ordained that they should walk'" (Form. of Concord, p. 597). "The source of all good works, the apostle says, is the new birth" (Ib.).

XXI. Ver. 11. *διό.*

Stier makes the ground of the *διό* extend still further back, and the point to lie especially "in the miserable condition from which they have now been delivered." Ellicott's suggestion that it refers "to the declaratory portion of the foregoing paragraph, vv. 1–7 (vv. 7–10 being an argumentative and explanatory addition)," harmonizes with this. Essentially the same, Eadie and Braune.

XXII. Ver. 11. ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς.

"The circumcision made with hands in the flesh is designated as a λεγομένη, *i.e.*, as something not real; it is even a κατατομή (Phil. iii. 3), a mutilation without a purpose. Circumcision has not lost any significance in itself, since it has been fulfilled in a typical sense" (Weiss' Bibl. Theol. of N. T., II. 118).

XXIII. Ver. 12. χωρὶς Χριστοῦ.

Harless, followed by Ellicott, makes the succeeding clauses explanatory of what is contained in these words. Grotius, de Wette, and Eadie interpret it as "without the promise of Christ." Calovius: "Destitute of faith in Christ, and without His saving knowledge." The true interpretation includes this, but comprehends still more. For it is the absence also of that personal communion of man with Christ which is designated as the mystical union, Gal. ii. 20; John xv. 5: Eph. iii. 17.

XXIV. Ver. 15. τὴν ἔχθραν.

The context points to the enmity of man towards God which lies back of this enmity of Jew and Gentile, to which primary reference is here made (Braune, Eadie). Ellicott co-ordinates the two ideas. Alford interprets it as enmity to God. Calovius and Harless regard "*hatred*" as standing for "*cause of hatred,*" pointing to the ceremonial law in the τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν. See Eadie for examples from the classics (Tacitus V. 4, 5; Horace, Satires, I. ix. 70; Juvenal), illustrating the hatred of Gentiles to Jews; also "Judaism at Rome" by Huidekoper, § 3, New York, 1880.

XXV. Ver. 15. ἵνα τοὺς δυό κτίσῃ κ.τ.λ.

Martensen makes a striking application of this passage to the relation of the individual to the Church (Chr. Ethics, I. 213): "They" (*i.e.*, Christians) "are all one, because only in their totality are they the *new man.* That is to say, that the new man is not perfectly realized in any single one of them, and without unity each of them is merely a fragment, reflecting only a single ray of Christ's image; for only the entire church can mirror Christ's kingdom."

XXVI. Ver. 19. πάροικοι.

The Greek metic was "at Athens a resident alien who paid a certain tax but enjoyed no civic rights" (Liddell and Scott). He was intermediate between the ξένος and the ἀστός. In Sophocles, Antigone, 852, it is applied to one whose home is neither among the living nor the dead. The best illustration of the condition of metics will be found in the oration of Lysias (who was himself a metic) against Eratosthenes. Cf. Grote's History of Greece, chapter lxv. Cremer defines the N. T. πάροικος, "one who dwells in a place without the rights of a home."

XXVII. Ver. 20. *ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ.*

Schmidt in the revised Meyer dissents, as also do Braune, Alford, and Ellicott. The dative denotes a more absolute and more closely fitting relation, and its use instead of the genitive is not accidental.

XXVIII. Ver. 20. *τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν.*

To these arguments, Eadie adds the following: "In writing to persons who had been Gentiles, whose faith in Christ rested not in old predictions realized in Him, but on apostolic proclamation of His obedience and death—a reference to the seers of the Hebrew nation would not have been very intelligible and appropriate. To Jews with whom the apostle had 'reasoned out of the Scripture,' and whom he had thus convinced that Jesus was the Christ, the reference would have been natural and stirring; but not so in an address to the Gentile portion of the church, situated in the city of Diana."

CHAPTER III.

Ver. 3. *ἐγνωρίσθη*] Elz. Matth. Reiche have *ἐγνώρισε*, in opposition to decisive testimony. A more precisely defining gloss. — Ver. 5. Before *ἑτέραις* Elz. has, likewise against decisive testimony, *ἐν*, which was attached on account of the double dative. — Ver. 6. *αὐτοῦ*] after *ἐπαγγ.* is, with Lachm. and Tisch., upon preponderating evidence, to be deleted. — Ver. 7. *ἐγενόμην*] Lachm. Tisch. [Treg.] Rück. [West. and Hort] read *ἐγενήθην*, after A B D^{x} F G ℵ. With this preponderant attestation the more to be preferred, in proportion to the ease with which the more current form might involuntarily creep in. — *τὴν δοθεῖσαν*] Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] and Rück.: *τῆς δοθείσης*, approved also by Griesb. Attested, it is true, by A B C D* F G ℵ, min. Copt. Vulg. It. Latin Fathers ; but how readily would the genitive present itself to the mechanical copyist after ver. 2 ! comp. ver. 8. — Ver. 8. *ἐν τοῖς*.] A B C ℵ, min. Copt. have merely *τοῖς*. So Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] and Rückert. Strongly enough attested ; specially as the parallel in subject-matter, Gal. i. 16, offered *ἐν* as an addition. — The neuter *τὸ πλοῦτος* is also here and at ver. 16 preponderantly attested. — Ver. 9. *πάντας*] suspected by Beza, placed within brackets by Lachm. But it is wanting only in A ℵ, two min. Cyr. Hilar. Jer. Aug. The omission, at any rate too feebly attested, may have been accidental, or even after *ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* intentional. — *οἰκονομία*] Elz. has *κοινωνία*, in opposition to almost all the witnesses. An interpretation. — After *κτίσαντι* Elz. has *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, which is defended, it is true, by Rinck (in whose view *Marcion* had deleted it) and by Reiche (who holds it to have been omitted by the *orthodox*), but is condemned by the decisive counter-testimony as an exegetico-dogmatic addition. — Ver. 12. *τὴν παῤῥησίαν κ. τὴν προσαγωγήν*] The second *τήν* is wanting in A B ℵ* 17, 80, Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] Rück. ; but its superfluousness occasioned the omission. F G have *τὴν προσαγωγὴν εἰς τὴν παῤῥησίαν*, a change produced by the absolute *τὴν προσαγ.* — Ver. 14. *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χ.* is wanting in A B C ℵ 17, 67** Copt. Aeth. Erp. Vulg. ms. and important Fathers. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Rück. Harless. An addition to *πατέρα* readily offering itself, although defended by Reiche (on insufficient internal grounds). — Ver. 16. *δώῃ*] A B C F G ℵ, 37, 39, 116, and several Fathers have *δῷ*. So Lachm. [West. and Hort] and Rück. With this important attestation *δῷ* is here the more to be preferred, as *δώῃ* offered itself to the copyists from i. 17. — Ver. 18. *βάθος κ. ὕψος*] Lachm. [West. and Hort] reads *ὕψος κ. βάθος*, on considerable but not decisive evidence. But the sequence of thought, "*height and depth,*" was more familiar. Comp. Rom. viii. 39. — Ver. 21. *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*] So D** K L, min. Syr. utr. Goth. Chrys. and other Greeks. But A B C ℵ 73, 80, 213, Copt. Arm. Slav. ms. Vulg. Jer. Pel. have *ἐν τ. ἐκκλ. καὶ ἐν Χ. Ἰ.* (so Lachm. [West. and Hort] and Rück.). D* F G, It. Ambrosiast. have *ἐν Χ. Ἰ. καὶ τῇ ἐκκλ.* Only 46 and Oros. have *ἐν Χ. Ἰ.* merely, *without ἐν τῇ ἐκκλ.*, evidence which is far too weak to justify suspicion of *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλ.* (in opposition to Koppe and Rück.). The *καί*, although strongly attested, is an old unsuitable connective addition ; and the placing of *ἐν τ. ἐκκλ.* after *ἐν* X. 'I. is a transposition in accordance with the sense of rank. Hence, with Tisch. and Reiche, the *Recepta* is to be upheld.

Contents.—On this account am I, Paul, the prisoner of God for the sake of you, the Gentiles (ver. 1). Effusion over the nature of his office as apostle of the Gentiles (vv. 2–12), which concludes with the entreaty to the readers not to become discouraged at the sufferings which he is enduring on their behalf (ver. 13). On this account he beseeches God that they might be inwardly strengthened in the Christian character, in order that they may know the whole greatness of the love of Christ, and thereby become filled with all divine gifts of grace (vv. 14–19). Doxology, vv. 20, 21.

Ver. 1. *On this account*, namely, in order that ye may be built unto the dwelling of God by means of the Spirit (ii. 22),—*on this behalf*, that your Christian development may advance towards that goal, *am I, Paul, the fettered one of Christ Jesus for the sake of you, the Gentiles.* The position of Paul in fetters on account of his labors as the apostle of the Gentiles[1] could only exert a beneficial influence upon the development of the Christian life of his churches, as edifying and elevating for them (comp. ver. 13), as, on the other hand, it must have redounded as a scandal to them, if he had withdrawn from the persecutions (Gal. vi. 12 ; 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff. ; Phil. ii. 17 f.). Hence the *τούτου χάριν* emphatically prefixed. — *ἐγὼ Παῦλος*] in the consciousness of his personal authority (comp. 2 Cor. x. 1 ; Gal. v. 2 ; 1 Thess. ii. 18 ; Col. i. 23 ; Philem. 9), which the bonds could not weaken, but only exalt (2 Cor. xi. 23 ff). — *ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ* 'I. X.] The *article* denotes the bound one of Christ *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, "pre-eminently," such as Paul could not but, in accordance with his special relation to Christ (Gal. i. 1, vi. 17), appear to himself and others. The *genitive* expresses the author of the being bound. Comp. 2 Tim. i. 8 ; Philem. 9. See Winer, p. 170. Paul regards himself, in keeping with the consciousness of his entire dependence on Christ (as *δοῦλος Χριστοῦ*), as the one *whom Christ has put in chains.*—As regards the *construction*, by many the simple *εἰμί* is rightly supplied after *ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ Χρ.* I.,[2] so that *ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ* X. 'I. is *predicate*, in connection with which some have neglected the article, others have rightly had regard to it.[3] He is, however, the *δέσμιος* of Christ *on behalf of the Gentiles ;* and this thought leads him in the sequel to explain himself more fully regarding his vocation as apostle of the Gentiles, whereupon he only briefly returns to the point of his imprisonment in ver. 13, after having been led away from it by the detailed exposition of the theme, to which he had been incited by the *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐθνῶν*. Free movement of thought natural in a letter. Supplementary additions, such as *legatione fungor*, "am discharging the duties of the embassay,"[1] or *hoc scribo*, "am writing this" (Camerarius, and the like),[2] are not implied in the context, and are therefore erroneous. *Others* have regarded the discourse as *broken off*, and have found the resumption either at ver. 8,[3] or at ver. 13,[4] or at ver. 14,[5] or only at iv. 1.[6] But all these hypotheses are—inasmuch as, according to the above explanation, ver. 1 in itself yields with ease and linguistic correctness a complete and suitable sense—unnecessary complications of the discourse. Baumgarten-Crusius regards the discourse as *entirely broken off* under the pressure of the crowding thoughts, so that it is *not at all* resumed in the sequel.—After ver. 1 only a comma is to be placed.

---

[1] "Quia gentes Judaeis adaequabat, incidit in suorum popularium odium," "Because he made the Gentiles equal to the Jews, he incurred the popular hatred of his own nation," Drusius. Comp. Grotius, Calovius.

[2] Syriac, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Cajetanus, Beza, Elsner, Calovius, Wolf, Michaelis, *Paraphr. ;* Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller [Schenkel], and others.

[3] See especially Beza.

Ver. 2. Confirmation of that which has just been said, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν, by the recalling of what the readers have heard concerning his vocation. "*For you, the Gentiles*," I say, *upon the presupposition that*, etc. This presupposition he expresses by εἴγε, *i.e.*, *tum certe si*, "then certainly if,"[7] it being implied in the *connection* (for of *his* church he *could* not presuppose anything else), not in the word itself, that he assumes this *rightly*. He *might* have written εἴπερ, *if at all*, *provided that*, or εἴπερ γε, *provided namely*,[8] but he has conceived the presupposition under the form *at least if*, *if namely*, and so denotes it. Comp. on Gal. iii. 4 and 2 Cor. v. 3 ; wherever εἴγε is used and the assumption is a *certain* one (as also at iv. 21), the latter is to be gathered from the *connection*. *From whom* the readers had heard the matter in question, their own consciousness told them, namely, *from Paul himself* and other Pauline teachers, so that εἴγε ἠκούσατε κ.τ.λ. is a reminder *of his preaching among them*. Hence our passage is wrongly regarded as at variance with the superscription πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, and as pointing to readers to whom Paul was not personally known ; while *others*, as Grotius,[9] have, without any ground in the context, assigned to the simple ἀκούειν the signification *bene intelligere*, "understand well ;" Calvin, on the other hand, had recourse to the altogether unnatural hypothesis : "Credibile est, quum ageret Ephesi, *eum tacuisse de his rebus*," "It is credible that when he was engaged at Ephesus he was silent concerning these matters ;" and Böttger[10] refers it to the *hearing* of this *Epistle read*, against which the very ἀναγινώσκοντες that follows in ver. 3 is decisive. Estius very correctly states that εἴγε is not "*dubitantis, sed potius affirmantis ;* neque enim ignorare quod hic dicitur poterant Ephesii, *quibus P. ipse evang. plusquam biennio praedicaverat*, "of one doubting, but rather of one affirming ; for the Ephesians could not have been ignorant to whom Paul himself had preached the Gospel for more than two years."[1] Paul might have expressed himself in the form of an assertion (ἠκούσατε γάρ, or ἐπεὶ ἠκούσατε), but the hypothetic form of expression constitutes a more delicate and suggestive way of recalling his preaching among them,[2] without, however, containing an *obliquam reprehensionem*, "indirect reproof,"[3] of which the context affords no trace.—τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος κ.τ.λ.] *the arrangement* (see on i. 10) *which has been made regarding the grace of God given to me with reference to you* (τῆς χάριτος is the objective genitive). The more precise explanation is then given by ὅτι κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν κ.τ.λ. The χάρις is here, in accordance with the context (τῆς δοθ. μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς), the divine bestowal of grace that took place in the entrusting him with the *apostolic office.* Comp. on Rom. xii. 3, xv. 15. *Others*, like Pelagius, Anselm, Erasmus, Grotius, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, *et al.*, have explained οἰκον. τ. χάρ. as *the office of administering evangelic grace;* but against this it may be urged that not τῆς δοθείσης, but τὴν δοθεῖσαν, must have been afterwards used. This mistake is avoided by Wieseler, p. 446 f., where he takes it as : the office for which I have been qualified by the grace conferred upon me on your behalf. This office the readers had *heard*, inasmuch as they had heard the *preaching* of the apostle. But how are we to justify the expression "to hear the *office*," instead of "to hear the official *preaching*"? The words would merely say : if ye have heard of the office, etc., Gal. i. 13 ; Col. i. 4 ; Philem. 5.

---

[1] Ambrosiaster, Castalio, Calvin, Vatablus.

[2] Already in early witnesses supplementary additions are met with in the text : πρεσβεύω in D* E 10, followed by Castalio and Calvin ; *postulo* in Clar., Germ. ; κεκαύχημαι in 71, 219, *al.*

[3] Oecumenius, Grotius.

[4] Zanchius, Cramer, Holzhausen.

[5] Theodoret, Luther, Piscator, Calixtus, Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Homberg, Schöttgen, Bengel Baumgarten, and others, including Flatt, Lachmann, Rückert, Winer, Matthies, Harless, Olshausen, Bisping, Bleek ; de Wette, characterizing this construction as "hardly Pauline."

[6] Erasmus Schmid, Hammond, Michaelis in note to his translation.

[7] Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 308.

[8] Xen. *Mem.* i. 4. 4, *Anab.* i. 7. 9 ; often in the tragedians.

[9] So also Rinck, *Sendschr. der Korinth.* p. 56, who, however, takes the correct view in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, p. 954.

[10] *Beitr.* iii. p. 46 ff.

Ver. 3. In this more detailed specification of the οἰκονομία meant in ver. 2, κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν has the emphasis : *by way of revelation*, expressing the *mode* of the making known, in accordance with a well-known adverbial usage.[4] In substance the δι' ἀποκαλύψεως of Gal. i. 12 is not different. According to the history of the conversion in Acts xxvi. (not according to Acts ix. and xxii.), we have here to think not merely of the disclosures that followed the event near Damascus (as Gal. i. 12), but also of the revelation connected with this event itself ; for the contents of what is revealed is here the blessing of the *Gentiles*, and with this comp. Acts xxvi. 17, 18, as also Gal. i. 16 ; hence from κατὰ ἀποκάλ. we may not infer a post-apostolic time of composition.[5] —ἐγνωρίσθη] namely, on the part of *God ;* comp. vv. 2, 5. —τὸ μυστήριον] see on i. 9 ; it applies here, however, not to the counsel of redemption in general, but to the inclusion of the *Gentiles* in it. It is not until ver. 6 that the apostle comes to express this special contents which is here meant. —καθώς *down to the end of ver.* 4, is not to be treated as a parenthesis, inasmuch as ὅ, ver. 5, attaches itself to the ἐν τῷ μυστ. τ. Χ. immediately preceding. —καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ] *as I before wrote in brief*, refers not to κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, but to ἐγνωρ. μοι τὸ μυστήρ., as is shown by ver. 4, where Paul characterizes that which was before written as evidence of his *knowledge* of the mystery, but not as evidence of the *revelation* by which he has attained to this knowledge. Groundlessly, and at variance with the subsequent present ἀναγινώσκοντες, Calvin, Hunnius, and others have[1] referred προέγρ. to an epistle *which has now been lost*, in support of which view the passage in Ignatius ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ[2] has been made use of.[3] It applies (not to i. 9, 10, as many would have it, but), as is proved by the here meant special contents of the μυστήριον (ver. 6), to the section last treated of, concerning the Gentiles attaining unto the Messianic economy of salvation, ii. 11–22.[4] — ἐν ὀλίγῳ] διὰ βραχέων, "in short," Chrysostom : ἐν is *instrumental.*[5] See Acts xxvi. 28.[6] The same is expressed by συντόμως, Acts xxiv. 4, *summarily.* Wetstein well puts it : "pauca tantum attigi, cum multa dici possent," "I have touched upon only a few things, although many could be said." Following Theodoret, Beza (with hesitation), Calvin, Grotius, Estius, Erasmus Schmid, Koppe, and others have taken it as a more precise definition of the πρό : *paulo ante*, "shortly before." But in a *temporal* sense ἐν ὀλίγῳ means nothing else than *in a short time* (see on Acts xxvi. 28 ; Comp. Plat. *Apol.* p. 22 B ; Dem. xxxiii. 18 ; Pind. *Pyth.* viii. 131 : ἐν δ' ὀλίγῳ βροτῶν τὸ τερπνὸν αὔξεται, "the delight of mortals will increase)," which is not suitable here ; πρὸ ὀλίγου must have been used (Acts v. 36, xxi. 38 ; 2 Cor. xii. 2, *al. ;* Plat. *Symp.* 147 E, *al.*).[7]

---

[1] De Wette dogmatically lays it down that the readers had no need, if the apostle had already exercised his apostolic calling among them, now first to learn from himself that he had received it. But in so speaking he has not attended to the fact that the object of the ἠκούσατε is not the reception of the apostolic vocation in general, but the *mode* of this reception (namely, κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, ver. 3). This account of the *manner* in which he had become their apostle he communicated to them when he was with them, and *of this* he reminds them now.

[2] As also the Attic writers, in place of ἐπεί γε, delicately use the hypothetic εἴγε ; see Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 5. 1.

[3] Vitringa, comp. Holzhausen.

[4] Bernhardy, p. 241.

[5] Schwegler.

Ver. 4. *In accordance with which ye, while ye read it, are able to discern*, etc.[8] — πρὸς ὅ applies to that which Paul προέγραψε, and πρός indicates the *standard of the judging ; in accordance with which.*[9] The inference : οὐκ ἔγραψεν ὅσα ἐχρῆν, ἀλλ' ὅσα ἐχώρουν νοεῖν, "He wrote not as much as was necessary, but as much as they were capable of understanding,"[10] finds no justification at all in what Paul has previously written. — ἀναγινώσκοντες] not *attendentes*, "attending,"[11] but, as always in the N. T., *legentes*, "reading." — τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χ.] is *to be taken together*, and before ἐν it was not needful to repeat the article, because συνιέναι ἐν (*to have understanding in a matter*) was a very current expression (2 Chron. xxxiv. 12 ; Josh. i. 7 ; Dan. i. 17). Comp. 3 Esdr. i. 33 : τῆς συνέσεως αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου. The genitive τοῦ Χριστοῦ is *ordinarily* taken as genitivas *objecti*, "an objective genitive :" the mystery *which has reference to Christ.* But, even apart from Col. i. 27, the whole subsequent detailed statement as far as ver. 12 suggests the contextually more exact view, according to which Paul means *the μυστήριον contained in Christ.* Christ Himself, His person and His whole work, especially His redeeming death, connecting also the Gentiles with the people of God (ver. 6), is the *concretum* of the Divine mystery. — The assailants of the genuineness of the Epistle find ver. 4 incompatible with the apostolic dignity,[1] nay, even "self-complacent and courting favor."[2] But here precisely the point brought into prominence, that the mystery had become known to him *κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν*, justifies the stress laid upon his *σύνεσις* in the mystery, so far as he has already manifested the same in his Epistle. The apostle might have appealed in proof of this *σύνεσις* to his *working*, but he might also—especially taking into account the change which had meanwhile occurred in the personal composition of the church—adduce for this purpose his *writing*, in doing which his very *apostolic dignity* raised him above considerations of the semblance of self-complacency and the like. Hardly would another, who had merely assumed the name of the apostle Paul, have put into his mouth such a self-display of his *σύνεσις*—which, in order not to fall out of his assumed apostolic part, he would rather have avoided. — As to *σύνεσις*, see on Col. i. 9.

---

[1] Although it was already rejected by Theodoret.

[2] See Introd. § 1.

[3] See Fabric. *Cod. Apoc.* I. p. 916.

[4] Comp. already Oecumenius.

[5] Yet it may also be conceived of *locally*, as Thuc. iv. 26. 2; 96. 2 (see Krüger): *in small space*, in a concise passage.

[6] Comp. the classical δι' ὀλίγων, Plat. *Phil.* p. 31 D, *Legg.* vi. p. 778 C, ἐν βραχεῖ and ἐν βραχέσι (Dem. 592, 8).

[7] Comp. ὀλίγον τι πρότερον, Herod. iv. 81.

[8] Wiggers (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1841, p. 433) regards as subject the Ephesians, not as such, but as representatives of the Gentile world : "*ye Gentiles.*" Arbitrarily imported, and entirely unnecessary. Doubtless the σύνεσις of the Ap. ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χ. must have been entirely beyond doubt for the readers in consequence of their personal connection with him ; but thereby his appeal to what he has just written does not become inappropriate, but only the more forcible and effective. There lies a certain μείωσις in this reference to that which he has just written.

[9] See Bernhardy, p. 205 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 652 ; Winer, p. 361.

[10] Oecumenius, comp. Chrysostom ; Bengel compares *ex ungue leonem*, "you may know the lion from its claw."

[11] Calvin.

Ver. 5. Not an *explanation, to what extent* he was speaking of a mystery :[3] for that the readers *knew*, and the design of bringing in a mere explanation would not be in keeping with the elevated solemn style of the whole verse ; but a triumphant outburst of the conscious exalted happiness of belonging to the number of those who had received the revelation of the mystery—an outburst, which was very naturally called forth by the sublime contents of the *μυστήριον*. — *ἑτέραις γενεαῖς*] may be either a *definition of time*, like the dative at ii. 12 (so taken *usually*) ; in that case *γενεαῖς* is not *periodis* or *temporibus*, "periods" or "times," in general, but: in other *generations* (comp. on ver. 21) ; or it may express the *simple dative relation*, so that *γενεαῖς* is *generationibus* :[4] *which to other generations was not made known*, according to which *τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρ.* would form a characteristic epexegesis.[5] This was my previous view. Yet the former explanation, as being likewise linguistically correct, and withal more simple and more immediately in keeping with the contrast *νῦν*, is to be preferred. The *ἕτεραι γεν.* are the generations *which have preceded* the *νῦν* ; and *τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρ.* (not elsewhere occurring with Paul) has the significance, that it characterizes men according to their *lower* sphere conditioned by their "ortum naturalem," "natural origin,"[6] under which they were incapable in themselves of understanding the *μυστήριον*. Comp. Gen. xi. 5 ; Ps. viii. 5, xi. 5 ; Wisd. ix. 6. That specially the *O. T. prophets* are meant by *τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπ.*, as Bengel supposed,[7] is wrongly inferred from *τοῖς ἁγίοις* ἀποστόλοις κ.τ.λ., since the contrast does not lie in the *persons*,[1] but in the *time* (ἑτέραις γενεαῖς . . . νῦν). It is true Ezekiel often bears the name בֶּן־אָדָם, "Son of man" (vii. 1, xii. 1, *al.*), not, however, as *prophet*, but as *man;* and thereby likewise his human lowliness and dependence upon God are brought home to him. — ὡς] By this expression, which (in opposition to Bleek) is to be left as *comparative*, the disclosure made to Abraham and the ancient prophets of the future participation of the Gentiles in Messiah's kingdom (Gal. iii. 8 ; Rom. ix. 24–26, xv. 9 ff.) remains undisputed ; for "fuit illis hoc mysterium quasi procul et cum involucris ostensum, "to them this mystery was as it were far off, and displayed under covering," Beza ; hence the prophetic prediction served only as *means* for the making known of the later complete revelation of the mystery (Rom. xvi. 26). — νῦν] in the Christian period. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 12. — ἀπεκαλύφθη] not a repetition of ἐγνωρίσθη, but the distinguishing *mode* in which *this* manifestation took place, is intended to be expressed : κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη, ver. 3. — τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστ. κ.τ.λ.] is not to be divided by a comma after ἁγίοις,[2] so that ἀποστ. αὐτ. κ. προφ. would be apposition or more precise definition, whereby the flow of the expression would be only needlessly interrupted. The predicate *holy* was already borne by the Old Testament prophets (2 Kings iv. 9 ; Luke i. 70 ; 2 Pet. i. 21), and this appellation at our passage by no means exposes the apostolic origin of the Epistle to suspicion ;[3] but it is very naturally called forth by the context, in order to distinguish the recipients of the revelation amidst the mass of the υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, in accordance with the connection, as God's special messengers and instruments, as ἅγιοι Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι (2 Pet. i. 21) ; whereupon the apostolic consciousness in Paul was great and decided enough not to suppress the predicate suggested by the connection,[4] while he is speaking of the apostles and prophets *in general*, whereas, immediately afterwards, at ver. 8, in speaking of *himself* in particular, he gives full play to his individual deep humility. How can we conceive that the author should thus in one breath have fallen *out* of his assumed part at ver. 5 with τοῖς ἁγίοις, by a "slip,"[5] and then have resumed it at ver. 8 with ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ ! — αὐτοῦ] not of *Christ*,[6] but of *God*, whose action is implied in ἐγνωρίσθη and ἀπεκαλύφθη. — καὶ προφήταις] quite as at ii. 20 — ἐν πνεύματι] The Holy Spirit is the divine principle, *through which* the ἀπεκαλύφθη took place. Comp. i. 17 ; 1 Cor. ii. 10 ff. Rückert wrongly takes it as : *in an inspired state*, which πνεῦμα never means, but, on the contrary, even without the article is the objective Holy Spirit. Comp. on ii. 22. Koppe and Holzhausen connect ἐν πνεύματι (*sc.* οὖσι) with προφήταις. In this way it would be an exceedingly superfluous addition, since prophets, who should *not* be ἐν πν., are inconceivable, whereas a revelation was conceivable even otherwise than through the Spirit (by means of theophany, angel, vision, ecstasy, etc.). Meier connects ἐν πν. even with ἁγίοις, so that the sense would be : *in sacred enthusiasm !* and Ambrosiaster[1] with the following εἶναι κ.τ.λ. Baur, p. 440, knows how to explain ἐν πνεύματι from a Montanistic view, and thinks that it is only on account of the prophets that it is applied to the apostles also.

---

[1] de Wette.

[2] Schwegler.

[3] Rückert, Meier.

[4] Vulgate.

[5] Lobeck, *ad Aj.* 308 ; Bernhardy, p. 55 ; Nägelsbach, *Anm. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, pp. 272, 307.

[6] Bengel.

[7] In quite an opposite way Jerome would *exclude* the ancient patriarchs and prophets from the *υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρ.* ; for these were rather *sons of God!*

---

[1] The ἀπόστολοι and προφῆται were also υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρ., but a sacred ἐκλογή, "selection," of the same.

[2] Lachmann, Bisping.

[3] de Wette derives ἁγίοις from the passage Col. i. 26 recast in post-apostolic times ; Baur : from the post-apostolic reverential looking back to the apostles.

[4] A side-glance at the Jews, who would have seen a blasphemy in the apostolic message of the joint-heirship of the Gentiles (Lange, *Apostol. Zeitalt.* I. p. 128), is utterly remote from the connection.

[5] Baur.

[6] Bleek.

Ver. 6. *Epexegetical* infinitive, more precisely specifying the contents of the μυστήριον : *that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs*, etc. This εἶναι (which is not to be changed into *should be*) is objectively contained in the redeeming work of Christ, and the subjective appropriation takes place by the conversion of the individuals. — συγκληρονόμα] denotes the joint possession (with the believing Jews) of eternal Messianic bliss,—a possession now indeed still ideal (Rom. viii. 24), but to be really accomplished at the setting up of the kingdom. See on i. 11, 14, v. 5 ; Acts xx. 32 ; Rom. viii. 17 ; Gal. iii. 28. — σύσσωμα καὶ συμμέτοχα κ.τ.λ.] That which is already sufficiently designated by συγκληρ. is yet again twice expressed, once figuratively and the next time literally ;[2] in which no climax is to be found,[3] but the great *importance* of the matter has led the apostle, deeply impressed by it, to accumulated description.[4] σύσσωμα denotes *belonging jointly to the body* (*i.e.*, as members to the Messianic community, whose head is Christ, i. 23, ii. 16). The word does not occur elsewhere, except in the Fathers,[5] and was perhaps formed by Paul himself. Comp. however, συσσωματοποιεῖν, Arist. *de mundo*, iv. 30. συμμέτοχος, too, occurs only here and v. 7, and besides, in Josephus, *Bell.* i. 24. 6, and the Fathers.[6] The ἐπαγγελία is *the promise of the Messianic blessedness*, which God has given in the O. T., comp. ii. 12. *He, however, who has joint share in the promise* is he to whom it jointly relates, in order to be jointly realized in his case ; hence ἡ ἐπαγγελία is not to be interpreted as *res promissa*, "a promised matter," which several[7] have referred to the *Holy Spirit* (Gal. iii. 14 ; Heb. vi. 4 ; Acts ii. 39), but at variance with the context (συγκληρ.). The thrice occurring συν has the πρῶτον of the Jews (Acts iii. 26 ; Rom. i. 16) as its presupposition.[8] — ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ] dependent on εἶναι, applies to all three elements, as does also the following διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγ. *In Christ*, as the Reconciler, the συγκληρονομία κ.τ.λ. of the Gentiles is objectively founded ; and *through the gospel*, which is proclaimed to them, the subjective appropriation in the way of faith is brought about. The annexing, with Vatablus, Koppe, and Holzhausen, ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ to τῆς ἐπαγγ., is not to be approved, just because the reader, as he needed no more precise definition in connection with συγκληρ. and σύσσωμα, understood also of himself *what* ἐπαγγελία was meant, and the *absolute* τῆς ἐπαγγ. (see the critical remarks) is more emphatic.

---

[1] Comp. Erasmus.

[2] Harless thinks, the one time after the analogy of *persons*, and the other time after the analogy of *things*. But as well in σύσσωμα as in συμμέτ. the relation of persons and of things is *combined*.

[3] Jerome, Pelagius, Zanchius, Schenkel.

[4] On the accumulation of synonymous expressions in earnest emotional discourse, comp. Düntzer, *Aristarch.* p. 41.

[5] See Suicer, *Thes.* II. p. 1191.

[6] Comp. συμμετέχω, 2 Macc. v. 20 ; Xen. *Anab.* vii. 8. 17 ; Plat. *Theaet.* p. 181 C.

[7] Menochius, Grotius, Bengel ; comp. Estius.

[8] But the thought that the substantial contents of the gospel are identical with Judaism (Baur, *Neutest. Theol.* p. 276) is incorrectly imported. See, in opposition to it, especially ii. 15.

Ver. 7. Διάκονος] Comp. Col. i. 23 ; 2 Cor. iii. 6 ; also Luke i. 2. Paul became a *servant* of the gospel when he was enjoined by God through Christ (Gal. i. 1, 15 ff. ; Acts ix. 22, 26) to devote his activity to the proclamation of the gospel. The *distinction from* ὑπηρέτης (used by Paul only at 1 Cor. iv. 1) is not, as Harless supposes, that διάκονος denotes the servant in his activity *for the service*, while ὑπηρέτης denotes him in his activity *for the Master* (see, in opposition to this, 1 Cor. xii. 3 ; Rom. xiii. 4 ; 2 Cor. vi. 3 ; Col. i. 7, iv. 6) ; but both words indicate *without distinction of reference* the relation of service, and the difference lies only in this, that the two designations, in accordance with their etymology, are originally borrowed from different concrete relations of service (διάκ., *runner ;* ὑπηρ, *rower ;* see the Lexicons, and on διάκονος, Buttm. *Lexil.* I. p. 218 ff.) ; in the usage, however, of the N. T., both words have retained merely the general notion of *servant*, as very frequently also with Greek writers. [See Note XXIX., p. 431.] In opposition to Harless it may be also urged that not only is the expression διακονεῖν τινί τι used, but also in like manner ὑπηρετεῖν τινί τι.[1] *The gift*, which was conferred upon Paul *by the divine grace*, and in consequence of which he became a servant of the gospel, is, agreeably to the context, the *apostolic office* (comp. vv. 2, 8), not the *donum linguarum*, "gift of tongues,"[2] nor yet the gift of the *Holy Spirit.*[3] — κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργ. τ. δυμ. αὐτοῦ] belongs to τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι. To the *efficacious action of the power* of God (comp. ver. 20, and on i. 19) the bestowal of the gift of grace leads back the mind of the apostle, in the consciousness of what he had been before, Gal. i. 13 ff. "Haec est *potentiae* ejus efficacia, ex nihilo *grande* aliquid efficere," "This is the efficacy of his power, viz., to make out of nothing something grand," Calvin. By the bestowal, in fact, of that gift of the divine grace Saul had become changed into *Paul ; hence* κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργ. τ. δυν. αὐτοῦ.

Ver. 8. The apostle now explains himself more fully on what had been said in ver. 7, and that entirely from the standpoint of the *humility*, with which, in the deep feeling of his personal unworthiness, he looked forth upon the greatness and glory of his vocation. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 9. — After ver. 7 a full stop is to be placed, and τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐαγγ. is the explanation of the χάρις αὕτη. Harless regards ἐμοὶ . . . αὕτη as a parenthetic excalamation, like ii. 6, and τοῖς ἔθν. εὐαγγ. as a more precise definition of what is meant by δωρεά. He finds it contrary to nature to meet in the long intercalation (vv. 2–13) a halting-point, and yet not a return to the main subject. But in opposition to the whole view of such an intercalation, see on ver. 1. And hardly could it occur to a reader not to connect εὐαγγελίσασθαι with the immediately preceding ἡ χάρις αὕτη, specially when τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ κ.τ.λ. points to the contrast of the *greatness* of the vocation, which very greatness is depicted, and in how truly grand a style ! from τοῖς ἔθνεσιν forward. — On the forms of degree constructed from the superlative (or even the comparative, as 3 John 4), see Sturz, *ad Maitt.* p. 44; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 135 f.; Winer, p. 65. In the analysis the *comparative* sense it to be maintained (the least, lesser than all).—The expression of humility πάντων ἁγίων,[1] *i.e.*, *than all Christians*, is even far stronger than 1 Cor. xv. 9. Οὐκ εἶπε τῶν ἀποστόλων, "He did not say than the apostles," Chrysostom. What was the ground of this self-abasement (which, indeed, Baur, p. 447, enumerates among the "heightening imitations") the reader *knew*, without the necessity for Paul writing it to him,—namely, not the consciousness of sin in general,[2] in which respect Paul knew that he stood on the same level with any other (Rom. iii. 22, xi. 32; Gal. iii. 22), as with every believer upon an equal footing of redemption by the death of Christ (Gal. iii. 13, 14; Rom. vii. 25, viii. 2), but *the deeply humbling consciousness of having persecuted Christ*, which, inextinguishable in him, so often accompanied his recalling of the grace of the apostolic office vouchsafed to him (1 Cor. xv. 9; Phil. iii. 6; comp. 1 Tim. i. 13).—τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] Paul was apostle of the *Gentiles.*—τὸ ἀνεξιχν. πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ] By this is meant the whole divine *fulness of salvation*, of which Christ is the possessor and bestower, and which is of such a nature that the human intellect cannot explore it so as to form an adequate conception of it. This does not *hinder* the proclamation, which, on the contrary, is rendered possible by revelation, but imposes on the knowledge (1 Cor. xiii. 9–12) as on the proclamation their limits. As to ἀνεξιχν., see on Rom. xi. 33.

---

[1] Xen. *Anab.* vii. 7. 46, *Cyr.* i. 6. 39 ; Soph. *Phil.* 1012.

[2] Grotius.

[3] Flatt, after older expositors.

Ver. 9. Καὶ φωτίσαι πάντας] According to Harless, who is followed by Olshausen [Hofmann and Braune], Paul makes a transition to *all men:* "not, however, to the *Gentiles* alone, but to *all.*" Wrongly, since Paul must have written καὶ πάντας φωτίσαι, as he had before prefixed τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. πάντας applies to all *Gentiles*, and the progress of the discourse has regard not to the persons, but to a particular main point (καί, and in particular), upon which Paul in his proclamation of the riches of Christ gives information to all Gentiles.—φωτίσαι] *collustrare*, "to lighten," of the enlightenment *of the mind* (John i. 9), which is here to be conceived of as brought about by means of the *preaching*. Comp. Heb. vi. 4,[3] x. 32; Ps. cxix. 130; Ecclus. xlv. 17. *Docere*, "to teach,"[4] hits doubtless the real sense, but unwarrantably abandons the *figure*. The possible difficulty that *Christ Himself* is in fact the light (John i. 9, xii. 35) disappears on considering that the apostles are *mediately* the enlightened ones (2 Cor. iv. 4; Matt. v. 14), the proclaimers and bearers (Acts xxvi. 18) of the divine light and its moral powers (v. 8).—τίς ἡ οἰκονομία κ.τ.λ.] *i.e.*, *what is the arrangement, which is made with regard to the mystery*, etc. As to οἰκονομία, see on i. 10, iii. 2; the *mystery* is that indicated as to its contents in ver. 6; and what has been *adjusted* or *arranged* with regard thereto (ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου) consists in the fact that this mystery, hidden in God from the very first, was to be made known in the present time through the church to the heavenly powers. See what follows. — ἀποκεκρυμ.] σεσιγημένου, Rom. xvi. 25. Comp. 1 Cor. ii. 7 ; Col. i. 26. — ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων] *from the world-periods*, since they have begun to run their course, *from the very beginning.* The mystery, namely, was *decreed* already πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, 1 Cor. ii. 7, comp. Eph. i. 4, but is conceived of as *hidden* only *since* the beginning of the ages, because there was no one previously *for whom* it could be hidden. The same thing with ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων here is denoted at Rom. xvi. 25 by the popular expression χρόνοις αἰωνίοις, "times eternal." We may add that ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων occurs in the N. T. only here and Col. i. 26 ; elsewhere is found the expression current also in Greek authors, ἀπ' αἰῶνος (Luke i. 70 ; Acts iii. 21), and ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος (John ix. 32). — τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι] *quippe qui omnia*[1] *creavit*, "*inasmuch as he created all things.*" Herein lies—and this is the significant bearing of this more precise designation of God—a confirmation of what has just been said, τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμ. ἀπὸ τῶν αἰών. ἐν τῷ Θεῷ. Bengel aptly observes : "rerum omnium creatio fundamentum est omnis reliquae oeconomiae, pro potestate Dei universali liberrime dispensatae," "The creation of all things is the foundation of all the rest of the economy unrestrictedly regulated according to the universal power of God." He who has created *all that exists* must already have had implicitly contained in His creative plan the great unfolding of the world, which forms the contents of this mystery, so that thus the latter was ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων hidden in God. Comp. on ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος, Acts xv. 18, and as to the idea which underlies our passage also, that already the creative word contemplated Christ as its aim,[2] Col. i. 16 ff., and the commentary thereon. Rückert thinks that Paul wishes to indicate how far it may not surprise us that He, from whom all things are derived, should have concealed a part of His all-embracing plan, in order to bring it to light only at the due time. But, apart from the fact that the creation of *all* things does not at all involve as a logical inference the concealment of a *part* of the divine plan, it was not the ἀποκεκρυμ. *in itself* that needed a ground assigned for it, since in fact this predicate is necessarily implied in the notion of μυστήριον, but the ἀποκεκρ. ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων. This ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων is the *terminus a quo*, which was introduced with the κτίσις τῶν πάντων. At variance with the context, Olshausen holds that Paul wished to call attention to the fact that the establishment of redemption itself [of which the apostle in fact is not speaking] is a creative act of God, which could have proceeded only from Him who created all things. Harless places τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσ. in connection with ἵνα κ.τ.λ., ver. 10. But see on ver. 10.

---

[1] The readings ἀνθρώπων in 4 and Chrys., ἀποστόλων in Archel., and ἁγίων ἀποστόλων in 46, are attempts at interpretation, of which ἀνθρώπων was meant to guard against understanding the ἁγίων of the angels; ἁγίων *is wanting* only in Marcion and 72*, and Semler ought not to have looked upon it as spurious.

[2] Harless.

[3] And Bleek, *ad loc.*

[4] Grotius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, and others.

---

[1] The totality of that which exists, the whole world. Every limitation of this *universal* meaning is unwarranted, as when Beza, Piscator, Flatt, and others refer it to *mankind.* "Unus Deus omnes populos condidit, sic etiam nunc omnes ad se vocat," "As one God created all nations, so also does He now call all to Himself," Beza. Holzhausen, too, arbitrarily limits it to all *spiritual* beings, called to everlasting life ; while Matthies mixes up also in κτίσαντι the *effecting of the spiritual blessedness.*

[2] Hence εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν would have been a more correct gloss than διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χρ., which the *Recepta* has.

Remark.—When *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* is recognized as not genuine (see the critical remarks), the possibility is taken away of referring *κτίσαντι* to the *moral* creation by *Christ*, as is done by Calvin, Zanchius, Calixtus, Grotius, Crell, Locke, Semler, Morus, Koppe, Usteri, Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others. But even if those words were genuine, the formal and absolute *κτίζειν*, as well as the emphatically prefixed and unlimited *τὰ πάντα*, would justify only the reference to the physical creation, Gen. i. Comp. Calovius and Reiche.

Ver. 10. Ἵνα] not *ecbatic* (Thomas Aquinas, Boyd, Zanchius, Estius, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Meier, Holzhausen), introduces the *design*, not, however, of *τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι*, as, in addition to those who understand *κτίσ.* of the ethical creation, also Harless would take it.[1] The latter sees in *τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι ἵνα κ.τ.λ.* an explanation "how the plan of redemption had been from all ages hidden in God; *inasmuch as it was He who created the world, in order to reveal in the church of Christ the manifoldness of His wisdom.*" But the very doctrine itself, that the design of God in the creation of the world was directed to the making known of His wisdom *to the angels*, and *by means of the Christian church*, has nowhere an analogy in the N. T.; according to Col. i. 16, *Christ* (the personal Christ Himself) is the aim of the creation of all things, *even of the angels*, who are here included in *τὰ πάντα*. But as *γνωρισθῇ* evidently corresponds to the *ἀποκεκρυμμένον*, and *νῦν* to the *ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων*, we cannot, without arbitrary disturbance of the whole arrangement of this majestic passage, regard *ἵνα γνωρισθῇ as other than the design of τοῦ ἀποκεκρ. ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τῷ Θεῷ*. This statement of aim stands in exact significant relation to the vocation of the apostle, ver. 8 f., through which this very making known to the heavenly powers was *partly* effected. The less is there reason for taking *ἵνα γνωρ. κ.τ.λ.*, with de Wette (on ver. 11) and Hofmann[2] (who are followed by Schenkel), after earlier expositors, as defining the aim of the *preaching of Paul*, ver. 8 f.; in which case, besides, it would be offensive that Paul should ascribe specially to *his* work in preaching as its destined aim that, in which the other apostles withal (comp. in particular Acts xv. 7), and the many preachers to the Gentiles of that time (such as Barnabas), had a share. The joining on to the adjectival element *ἀποκεκρ. κ.τ.λ.* produces no syntactical incongruity, but is as much in keeping with the carrying forward of the discourse by way of chain in our Epistle, as in accord with the reference of so significant a bearing to ver. 8 f. — *γνωρισθῇ νῦν*] The emphasis is not upon *νῦν*,[3] but upon *γνωρισθῇ*, in keeping with the *ἀποκεκρ.*: in order that it should not remain hidden, but should *be made known*, etc. — *ταῖς ἀρχαῖς κ. τ. ἐξουσίαις*] See on i. 21. The *angelic powers* are to recognize in the case of the Christian church the wisdom of God;—what a church-*glorifying* design, out of which God kept the *μυστήριον* from the beginning locked up in Himself! To the *heavenly* powers (comp. 1 Pet. i. 12), which therefore are certainly not thought of as abstractions, the *earthly* institute is to show the wisdom of

---

[1] So also Baur refers it, p. 425, but explains the thus resulting aim of the creation from the doctrine of the Valentinians.

[2] *Schriftbew.* I. p. 361.

[3] Rückert and others.

God; an *even*, however, is quite arbitrarily inserted before ταῖς ἀρχ.[1] The explanation of the *diabolic powers*,[2] which Vorstius, Bengel, Olshausen, Hofmann, Bleek at least understand *as included*, is entirely foreign to the context (it is otherwise at vi. 12), even though ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (comp. i. 3, 20), were not added. Throughout the whole connection the contrast of earth and heaven prevails. Wrongly, too, we may add, *secular rulers*,[3] *Jewish archons*,[4] *heathen priests*,[5] and Christian *church-overseers*,[6] have been understood as here referred to (comp. i. 21); while Koppe would embrace "quicquid est vi, sapientia, dignitate insigne," "whatever is remarkable for force, wisdom, dignity," and would only not exclude the angels on account of ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρ. — ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρ. is, as always in our Epistle (see on i. 3), definition of *place: in heaven*, not: *in the case of the heavenly things*, which are to be perceived in connection with the church[7] and such like[8] [See above, Note III., on ch. i. 3.] It is most naturally to be combined (comp. vi. 12) with ταῖς ἀρχ. κ. τ. ἐξουσ., in which case it was not needful to place ταῖς before ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, seeing that the ἐν τοῖς ἐπουραν., more precisely fixing the definition of the notion of the ἀρχαί and ἐξουσίαι (for even upon earth there are ἀρχαί and ἐξουσίαι), is blended into a unity of notion with those two words,[9] so that there is no linguistic necessity for connecting, as does Matthies,[10] ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρ. with γνωρ. — The question why Paul did not write simply τοῖς ἀγγέλοις is not to be answered, with Hofmann, to the effect, that the spirits ruling in the *ethnic* world are intended, because such a special reference of the general expression τ. ἀρχ. κ. τ. ἐξουσ. must have been *specified* (by the addition of τῶν ἐθνῶν, or something of that sort); but to the effect, that the designation of the angels on the side of their power and rank, in contradistinction to the διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, serves for the *glorifying of the* ἐκκλησία. The designation corresponds to the fulness and the lofty pathos by which the whole passage is marked. In i. 21, also, an analogous reason is found, namely, the glorifying of *Christ*. It is to be observed, in general, that the name ἄγγελος does not occur at all in our Epistle. — διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας] The

---

[1] Grotius, Meier.

[2] Ambrosiaster, Vatablus, not Estius.

[3] Zeger, Knatchbull.

[4] Schöttgen, Locke.

[5] van Til.

[6] Zorn.

[7] Zeltner, comp. Baumgarten.

[8] See in Wolf.

[9] Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 195.

[10] The whole apprehension of our passage by Matthies is mistaken. He refers τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσ. to all that God has either created in the natural reference of the term, or accomplished in a spiritual respect for the salvation of men. According to his view, ἵνα applies to τῷ τὰ π. κτίσ.; ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐξουσίαι are "the high and mighty ones who live in the world, or even in an invisible spiritual manner play their part in the same;" τὰ ἐπουράνια is to be taken "as the actually subsisting aggregate of all that is heavenly—as the kingdom of God." In the heavenly kingdom the wisdom of God becomes manifest by means of the church, and particularly to these high and mighty ones, because these *are* now, in the heavenly kingdom founded by Christ, *brought*, by means of the church, *to the consciousness of their powerlessness.*—Thus, in fact, there are, as well in the notion of κτίζειν as in that of ἀρχαὶ κ. ἐξουσ., two wholly different conceptions combined, in opposition to the hermeneutic principle of the unity of the sense; τὰ ἐπουράνια is arbitrarily generalized in a spiritualistic way, and the thought that the ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐξουσίαι are brought to the consciousness of their powerlessness is purely imported, and the more mistakenly, inasmuch as it is God's σοφία, not His δύναμις, of which it is here said that it is made manifest to the ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐξους.

Christian church (*i.e.*, the collective body of believers regarded as one community, comp. 1 Cor. xii. 28, x. 32, xv. 9 ; Gal. i. 11 ; Phil. iii. 6 ; Col. i. 18, 24,—hence not betraying the later *Catholic* notion) is, in its existence and its living development, as composed of Jews and Gentiles combined in a higher unity, the medium *de facto* for the divine wisdom becoming known, the actual voucher of the same ; because it is the actual voucher of the redemption which embraces all mankind and raises it above the hostile contrast of Judaism and heathenism,—this highest manifestation of the divine wisdom (Rom. xi. 32 f.). To the angels, in accordance with their ministering interest in the work of redemption (Matt. xviii. 10 ; Luke xv. 7, 10 ; 1 Cor. xi. 10 ; Heb. i. 14 ; 1 Pet. i. 12), the church of the redeemed is therefore, as it were, the mirror, by means of which the wisdom of God exhibits itself to them. [See Note XXX., p. 431.] — *πολυποίκιλος*].[1] It signifies *much-manifold*, *i.e.*, in a high degree manifold, quite corresponding to the Latin *multivarius.* That it signifies *very wise*[2] has been erroneously assumed from Aesch. *Prom.* 1308, where ποίκιλος means *crafty.* As πολυποίκιλος, the wisdom of God manifests itself to the angels through the church, inasmuch as the counsel of the redemption of the world is therein presented to them in its universal realization, and they thus behold the manifold ways and measures of God, which He had hitherto taken with reference to the Jews and Gentiles, all now in their connection with the institute of redemption,—all uniting in this as their goal. The church is thus for them, as regards the manifold wisdom of God, the *central fact of revelation ;* for the πολυποικίλους ὁδοὺς Θεοῦ, which they before knew not as to their ultimate end, but only in and by themselves (and how diverse were these ways with the Jews and with the Gentiles !), they now see in point of fact, through the church ("haec enim operum divinorum theatrum est," "for this is the theatre of divine works," Bengel), as πολυποίκιλος σοφία. Thus by the appearing of the ἐκκλησία as a fact in the history of salvation, the wisdom of the divine government of the world has been on every side unveiled and brought to recognition. Entirely without warrant, Baur assumes, p. 429, that the *Gnostic* σοφία, with its heterogeneous forms and conditions,[3] was present to the mind of the writer.

Ver. 11. Κατὰ πρόθεσιν τῶν αἰώνων] belongs neither to πολυποίκιλος,[4] nor to σοφία,[5] nor does it relate to ver. 9,[6] nor yet to all that precedes from ver. 3 or ver. 5,[7] but to ἵνα γνωρισθῇ κ.τ.λ., giving information important in its bearing on this ἵνα : *in accordance with the purpose of the world-periods, i.e.*, in conformity with the purpose which God had during the world-periods (from the commencement of the ages up to to the execution of the purpose) ; for already πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου it was formed, i. 3, but from the beginning of the world-ages it was hidden in God, ver. 9. On the genitive, comp. Jude 6 ; Ps. cxlv. 13 ; Winer, p. 169. *Others*, incorrectly, take it as : the purpose *concerning the different periods of the world*, according to which, namely,

---

[1] Eur. *Iph. T.* 1149 ; Eubul. in Athen. xv. p. 678 D ; Orph. v. 11, lx. 4.

[2] Wolf, Koppe, Rosenmüller.

[3] Comp. Iren. *Haer.* i. 4 1.

[4] Holzhausen.

[5] Koppe, Baumgarten-Crusius.

[6] Michaelis.

[7] Flatt, comp. Zanchius, Morus.

God at first chose no people, then chose the Jews, and lastly called Jews and Gentiles to the Messianic kingdom;[1] for it is only the one purpose, accomplished in Christ, that is spoken of. See what follows. According to Baur, κατὰ πρόθεσιν τῶν αἰών. means: according to what God ideally proposed to Himself in the aeons (that is, the subjects of the divine ideas, constituting as such the essence of God). According to the Gnostic view, this returns, after it has been accomplished in Christ, as the realized idea back into itself. — ἣν ἐποίησεν ἐν Χ. 'Ι.] applies not to σοφία,[2] but to πρόθεσιν, and means: *which He has fulfilled in Christ Jesus.*[3] Comp. τὸ θέλημα ποιεῖν (ii. 3; Matt. xxi. 31; John vi. 38), τὴν γνώμην ποιεῖν (Acts xvii. 17). *Others:* which He has *formed* in Christ Jesus.[4] Linguistically admissible. Comp. Mark iii. 6, xv. 1; Isa. xxix. 15; Herod. i. 127. But the context tells in favor of the first-named interpretation, since what follows is the explanation assigning the ground of the purpose not as *formed*, but as *carried into effect;* hence not merely ἐν Χριστῷ is said, but ἐν Χριστῷ 'Ιησοῦ (comp. i. 5), since not the *forming* of that purpose, but its *accomplishment*, took place in the historically manifested Messiah, *Jesus*—in Him, in His personal self-sacrifice is the realization of that divine purpose contained.

Ver. 12. 'Εν ᾧ κ.τ.λ.] gives the experimentally (ἔχομεν) confirmatory proof for the just stated ἣν ἐποίησεν ἐν Χ. 'Ι. See on i. 7. — τὴν παῤῥησίαν] denotes not the *libertatem dicendi*, "freedom of speech," as at vi. 19, since not merely the *apostle's*[5] experimental consciousness, but that of the *Christian* is, in harmony with the context, expressed by ἔχομεν; and the limitation to *prayer*[6] is entirely arbitrary. It is rather *the free, joyful mood of those reconciled to God*, in which they are assured of the divine grace (the opposite: fear of God's wrath). Comp. Heb. iii. 6, iv. 16, x. 19, 35; 1 John ii. 28, iii. 21, iv. 17, v. 14; also Wisd. v. 1, and see Grimm *in loc.;* Bleek on *Hebr.* II. 1, p. 416 f. This παῤῥησία κατ' ἐξοχήνἐ, "pre-eminently," is denoted by the article. — καὶ τὴν προσαγωγήν] See on ii. 18. Likewise a *formally consecrated* notion. — ἐν πεποιθήσει] Fundamental disposition, *in which* we have, etc. For without *confidence* (see, as to πεποίθ., on 2 Cor. i. 15) the παῤῥησία and the προσαγωγή are not possible. How gloriously is this πεποίθησις on the part of the apostle expressed at *e.g.* Rom. viii. 38 f.! — διὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ] *Causa medians*, "instrumental cause," of the ἔχομεν κ.τ.λ. *Christ* is the objective ground on which this rests, and *faith in Christ* is the subjective means for its appropriation and continued possession, Rom. v. 1, 2. In αὐτοῦ there is implied nothing more than in εἰς αὐτόν (see on Rom. iii. 22; Gal. iii. 22), and what Matthies finds in it (the faith having reference to Him *alone*) is a sheer importation.

Ver. 13. Once more reviewing the whole section concerning the great contents of his office as apostle of the Gentiles (vv. 2–12), he concludes it, in especial retrospective reference to the introduction thereof (ver. 1), with the *entreaty to the readers* not to become discouraged, etc., in order thereupon yet further to attach to ver. 14 ff. à rich outpouring of *intercession for them*, which terminates in an enthusiastic *doxology* (ver. 20 f.). According to this view, *δίο* has its reference not merely in ver. 12, but in the whole of what Paul has said, vv. 2–12, regarding his office, namely : *On that account*, because so great and blissful a task has by God's grace been assigned to me in my calling, *I entreat you*, etc. The greater the office conferred by God, the less does it become those whom it concerns to take offence or become downcast at the sufferings and persecutions of its holder. — *μὴ ἐκκακεῖν*] applies to the *readers: that ye become not disheartened*, faint-hearted and cowardly in the confession of the gospel,—not to *Paul: that I become not disheartened*, as Syriac, Theodoret, Jerome, Bengel, Semler, and others, including Rückert, Harless, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius [Hofm. Braune, Cremer Wörterb.], take it. In opposition to the latter, it may be urged that the supplying of *Θεόν* after *αἰτοῦμαι*, demanded in connection therewith, is in no wise indicated by the context, which rather in the *bare αἰτοῦμαι* (comp. 2 Cor. v. 20, x. 2) conveys only the idea of a request to the readers (it is otherwise at Col. i. 9 ; Jas. i. 6). Further, *ἥτις ἐστὶ δόξα ὑμῶν* manifestly contains a motive *for the readers*, to fulfil that which Paul entreats. Only from *τούτου χάριν*, ver. 14, begins an *intercession for the readers*, that God may strengthen *them*.[1] The *μου*, finally, after *θλίψεσι* is wholly superfluous, if Paul is imploring constancy *for himself;* but not, if he is beseeching *the readers* not to become faint-hearted, while *he* is suffering for them. — As to the form *ἐγκακεῖν* in Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Rückert, see on 2 Cor. iv. 1. — *ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσί μου ὑπὲρ ὑμ.*] *in the tribulations which I endure for your sake* (namely, as apostle of the *Gentiles*). Comp. Paul's own so touching comment upon this *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, in Phil. ii. 17. The *ἐν* denotes the *subsisting relation, in which* their courage is not to give way. See Winer, p. 346. To this conception the explanation *on account of*[2] is also to be referred. *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* is rightly attached, without repetition of the article, to *ταῖς θλίψ. μου*, because one may say *θλίβεσθαι ὑπέρ τινος* (2 Cor. i. 6 ; comp. Col. i. 24). Comp. on Gal. iv. 14. Harless connects *ὑπὲρ ὑμ.* with *αἰτοῦμαι* : *I pray for your benefit.* How violently opposed to the order of the words, and, with the right view of *αἰτοῦμαι*, impossible ! — *ἥτις ἐστὶ δόξα ὑμῶν*] is designed to animate to the fulfilment of the entreaty, so that *ἥτις* introduces an explanation serving as a motive thereto,[3] not equivalent to *ἥ*, but referring what is predicated "*ad ipsam rei naturam*," "to the very nature of the subject,"[4] like *qui quidem, quippe qui, utpote qui.* *ἥτις* may be referred either to the *μὴ ἐκκακεῖν*,[5] or to *ταῖς θλίψεσί μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* (so *usually*). In either case the relative is attracted by the following

---

[1] Schoettgen, comp. Chrysostom, Theophylact, Estius, Cornelius à Lapide, Baumgarten, Semler.

[2] Jerome, Luther, Moldenhauer.

[3] So Castalio, Vatablus, Grotius, Zachariae, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Holzhausen, Matthies, Olshausen, de Wette, Bleek and others.

[4] So Beza, Calvin, Estius, Michaelis, Morus, *et al.*, including Flatt, Rückert, Meier, Harless, Baumgarten-Crusius; also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 230.

[5] Vatablus.

[6] Bengel, Holzhausen.

---

[1] Harless finds, with Rhenferd (in Wolf), the connection : "ut *pro se* primum, tum *pro Ephesiis* oret." But this change of the persons would have needed to be *indicated* by emphatic pronouns, if it were not to be looked upon as imported.

[2] Erasmus, Beza, Piscator, Estius, and others.

[3] Herm. *ad Oed. R.* 688 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 385.

[4] Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* p. 190.

[5] Theodoret, Zanchius, Harless, Olshausen, Schenkel.

δόξα, and this not as Hebraizing,[1] but as a Greek usage.[2] The *usual* reference is the *right* one ; the *sufferings* of the apostle for the readers were *a glory of the latter*, it redounded to their *honor* that he suffered for them,[3] and this relation could not but raise them far above the *ἐκκακεῖν*, else they would not have accorded with the thought brought to their consciousness by the *ἥτις ἐστὶ δόξα ὑμῶν*. The referring of *ἥτις* to *μὴ ἐκκακεῖν* is inconsistent with the correct explanation of the latter (see above) ; for if Paul had said that it was glorious for the readers *not to grow faint*, he would either have given expression to a very *general* and *commonplace* thought, or else to one of which the specific contents must first be *mentally supplied* (gloria *spiritualis*, "*spiritual* glory"); whereas *the* proposition : "*my tribulations are your glory*," is in a high degree appropriate alike to the ingenious mode of expression, and to the apostolic sense of personal dignity, in which is implied a *holy pride*. Comp. Phil. ii. 17.

Vv. 14, 15.[4] Τούτου *χάριν*] *on this account*, in order that ye may not become disheartened, ver. 13. Against the view that there is here a resumption of ver. 1, see on that verse. — *κάμπτω κ.τ.λ.*] *τὴν κατανενυγμένην δέησιν ἐδήλωσεν*, "He indicated his entranced supplication," Chrysostom. See on Phil. ii. 10. "A *signo* rem denotat," "from the sign he denotes the thing," Calvin ; so that we have not, with Calovius and others, to think of an *actual* falling on his knees during the writing. Comp. Jerome, who makes reference to the *genua mentis*, "knees of the mind." — *πρός*] *direction* of the activity : *before the Father*. — *ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ κ.τ.λ.*] Instead of saying : *before the Father of all angels and men* (a designation of God which naturally suggested itself to him as an echo of the great thoughts, ver. 10 and ver. 6), Paul expresses himself more graphically by an ingenious paronomasia, which cannot be reproduced in German (*πατέρα . . . πατριά*) : *from whom every family in heaven and upon earth bears the name*, namely, the name *πατριά*, because God is *πατήρ* of all these *πατριαί*. Less simple and exact, because not rendering justice to the *purposely chosen* expression employed by Paul only here, is the view of de Wette : "every race, *i.e.*, every class of beings which have arisen (?), bears the name of God as its Creator and Father, just as human races bear the name from their ancestor, *e.g.*, the race of David from David." — *ἐξ οὗ*] *forth from whom ;* origin of the name, which is derived from God as *πατήρ*.[5] — *πᾶσα πατριά*] *πατριά*, with classical writers ordinarily *πάτρα*, is equivalent to *gens*, a body belonging to a common stock, whether it be meant in the narrower sense of a *family*,[1] or in the wider, national sense of a *tribe* (Acts iii. 25 ; 1 Chron. xvi. 28 ; Ps. xxii. 27 ; Herod. i. 200). In the latter sense here ; for every *gens* in the heavens can only apply to the various *classes of angels* (which are called πατριαί, not as though there were propagation among them, Matt. xxii. 30, but because they have God as their Creator and Lord for a Father [see Weiss, Bibl. Theol. II. 106, AMER. ED.] ; as a suitable analogue, however, to the classes of angels, appear on earth not the particular families, but the *nationalities*. Rightly Chrysostom and his successors explain the word by γενεαί or γένη. The Vulgate has *paternitas*, a sense indicated also by Jerome, Theodoret, and others. Theodoret says : ὃς ἀληθῶς ὑπάρχει πατὴρ, ὃς οὐ παρ' ἄλλου τοῦτο λαβὼν ἔχει, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις μεταδέδωκε τοῦτο, "who is truly a father, since he has this, not by receiving it from another, but himself communicated it to the rest." This view (comp. Goth.: "all *fadreinis*") is expressed by Luther (approved in the main by Harless [and by Cremer, Lexicon]) : *Who is the true Father over all that are called children*, etc. But πατριά never means *fathership* or fatherliness (πατρότης), and what could be the meaning of that fathership *in heaven?*[2] πᾶσα, *every*, shows that Paul did not think only of *two* πατριαί, the totality of the angels and the totality of men,[3] or of the blessed in heaven and the elect on earth,[4] but of a *plurality*, as well of angelic as of human πατριαί ; and to this extent his conception is, as regards the *numerical form*, though not as regards the *idea* of πατριά, different from that of the Rabbins, according to which the angels[5] are designated as *familia superior*, "the higher family."[6] Some have even explained πᾶσα πατριά as *the whole family*, in which case likewise either the *angels and men*,[7] or *the blessed in heaven and Christians on earth*,[8] have been thought of : but this is on the ground of linguistic usage erroneous. Comp. on ii. 21. [See Note XXXI., p. 431 seq.] — ὀνομάζεται] *bears the name*, namely, the name πατριά ; see above. The text does not yield anything else ;[9] and if many[10] have understood the name *children of*

---

[1] Beza, Matthies, and many.

[2] Comp. as regards the ordinary exegesis, according to which the *number* also is attracted, Dem. *c. Aphob.* p. 853. 31 : ἔχει . . . ὀγδόηκοντα μὲν μνᾶς, ἣν ἔλαβε προῖκα τῆς μητρός ; and see, in general, Winer, p. 150.

[3] This assertion stands in correct connection with his high apostolic position. That the apostle as δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ suffered for the Gentile-Christians, could only redound to the honor of the latter, inasmuch as they could not but appear of the higher value the more he did not refuse to undergo afflictions for them. This we remark in opposition not only to Rückert, who finds it most advisable to leave the contents of the clause indefinite, in order not to deprive it of its *oratorical* significance, but also in opposition to Harless and Olshausen, who are of opinion that the sufferings of the apostle could not in themselves be any glory for the Gentile-Christians. They are so on account of the *dignity of the sufferer*, and of his *relation* to those *for whose sake* he suffered.

[4] On ver. 15, see Reiche, *Comm. Crit.* p. 156 ff.

[5] On ὀνομάζεσθαι ἐκ, comp. Hom. *Il.* x. 68 :

πατρόϑεν ἐκ γενεῆς ὀνομάζων ἄνδρα ἕκαστον. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 5. 12 ; ἔφη δὲ καὶ τὸ διαλέγεσϑαι ὀνομασϑῆναι ἐκ τοῦ συνιόντας κοινῇ βουλεύεσϑαι. Soph. *Oed. R.* 1036.

[1] To this head belongs also the Jewish-genealogical distinction from φυλή, according to which πατριά denotes a branch of one of the twelve tribes (φυλῶν). See on Luke ii. 4. Similarly in the sense of a family-association often with Pindar. On the relation of the word to the kindred φρατρία, see Boeckh, *ad Pind. Nem.* V. L. iv. 47 ; Dissen, p. 387 ; Hermann, *Staatsalterth.* § 5. 4, 10.

[2] Jerome finds it in the *archangels*, and Theodoret says : οὐρανίους πατέρας τοὺς πνευματικοὺς καλεῖ, and cites 1 Cor. iv. 15.

[3] Calvin, Grotius, Wetstein, Koppe, and others.

[4] Calovius, Wolf.

[5] With the Cabbalists, the Sephiroth.

[6] See Wetstein, p. 247 f. ; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 1753 ; Schoettgen, *Horae*, p. 1237 f.

[7] Michaelis, Zachariae, Morus, Meier, Olshausen, and earlier expositors.

[8] Beza.

[9] For the very reason that Paul does *not* put any defining addition to ὀνομάζεται (in opposition to Reiche's objection). Nor is it to be objected, with Reiche, that the human πατριά bears the name not from God, but from the human ancestor. This *historical* relation remains entirely unaffected by the *higher* thought, that they are called πατριά from the universal, heavenly Father.

[10] Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Wolf, Bengel, Michaelis, Zachariae, Morus, Koppe, and others, including Flatt and Olshausen.

God, this is purely imported. Others have taken "*nomen pro re*," "the name for the thing" (Zanchius, Menochius, Estius, *et al*), so that ὀνομάζεσθαι would denote *existere*. So, too, Rückert, according to whom Paul designs to express the thought that God is called the Father, inasmuch as all that lives in heaven and upon earth has from Him existence and name (*i.e.*, dignity and peculiarity of nature). Contrary to linguistic usage ; εἶναι ὀνομάζεται must at least have been used in that case instead of ὀνομάζεται.[1] Incorrectly also Holzhausen : ὀνομάζειν means *to call into existence*. Reiche takes ἐξ οὗ ὀνομάζεται (*of whom it bears the name*) as the expression of the highest *dominion* and of the befitting *reverence* due, and refers πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρ. *to the pairings of the Aeons*. The former without linguistic evidence : the latter a hysteroproteron.

REMARK 1.—In ἐξ οὗ . . . ὀνομάζεται God is certainly characterized as *universal Father, as Father of all angel-classes in heaven and all peoples upon earth.* Comp. Luther's gloss : "All angels, all Christians, yea, all men, are God's children, for He created them all." But it is not at all meant by the apostle in the bare sense of creation, nor in the rationalistic conception of the all-fatherhood, when he says that every πατριά derives this name ἐκ Θεοῦ, as from its father ; but in the higher spiritual sense of the divine Fatherhood and the sonship of God. He thinks, in connection with the ἐξ οὗ, of a higher πατρόθεν than that of the mere creation. For πατριαί, so termed from God as their πατήρ, are not merely all the communities of *angels*, since these were indeed υἱοὶ Θεοῦ from the beginning, and have not fallen from this υἱότης ; but also all nationalities among *men*, inasmuch as not only the Jews, but also all Gentile nations, have obtained part in the Christian υἱοθεσία, and the latter are συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμέτοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (ver. 6). If this has not yet become completely realized, it has at any rate already been so partially, while Paul writes ; and in God's counsel it stands ideally as an accomplished fact. *On that account* Paul says with reason also of *every* nationality upon earth, that it bears the name πατριά, because God is its Father. Without cause, therefore, Harless has taken offence at the notion of the All-fatherhood, which is here withal clearly though ideally expressed, and given to the passage a limitation to which the all-embracing mode of expression is entirely opposed : "whose name every child [*i.e.*, every *true* child] in heaven and upon earth bears." Consequently, as though Paul had written something like : ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα ἀληθινὴ πατριὰ κ.τ.λ. With a like imported limitation Erasmus, *Paraphr.* : "omnis cognatio *spiritualis*, qua conglutinantur sive angeli in coelis, sive *fideles* in terris," "every spiritual relationship, whereby either angels in heaven, or the believing on earth are united."

REMARK. 2.—With the non-genuineness of τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. (see the critical remarks) falls also the possibility of referring ἐξ οὗ to *Christ*.[2] But if those words were genuine (de Wette, among others, defends them), ἐξ οὗ would still apply to *God*, because ἐξ οὗ κ.τ.λ. characterizes the *fatherly* relation, and ἵνα δῷ κ.τ.λ. applies to the Father. — Lastly, *polemic* references, whether in opposition to the *particularism of the Jews*,[1] or even in opposition to "scholam *Simonis*, qui plura principia velut plures Deos introducebat, "the school of Simon, which introduced a number of principles, as though a number of gods,"[2] or, in opposition to the *worship of angels*,[3] or in opposition to the Gnostic doctrine of Syzygies,[4] are to be utterly dismissed, because arbitrary in themselves and inappropriate to the character and contents of the prayer before us.

---

[1] Comp. Isaeus, *de Menecl. her.* 41 : τὸν πατέρα, οὗ εἶναι ὠνομάσθην, Plat. *Pol.* iv. p. 428 E : ὀνομάζονταί τινες εἶναι.

[2] Beza, although with hesitation, Calvin, Zanchius, Hammond, Cramer, Reiche, and others.

Ver. 16. Ἵνα δῷ] (see the critical remarks) introduces the *design* of the κάμπτω κ.τ.λ., and *therewith* the contents of the prayer. Comp. on i. 17. — κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ] *i.e.*, in accordance with the fact that His glory is in so great fulness. Comp. on i. 7. It may be referred either to δῷ ὑμῖν or to what follows. The former is the most natural; comp. i. 17. According to His rich fulness in glory, God *can* and *will* bestow that which is prayed for. The δόξα, namely, embraces the *whole* glorious perfection of God, and can only with caprice be limited to the *power*[5] or to the *grace.*[6] — δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι] instrumental dative: *with power* (which is instilled) *to be strengthened;* opposite of ἐκκακεῖν, ver. 13. That which effects this strengthening is the Holy Spirit (διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ). Comp. Rom. xv. 13. According to Harless, it is dative of the *form*,[7] so that the being strengthened in *power* is regarded as opposed to the being strengthened in knowledge, or the like. But to what end would Paul have added εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἀνθρ., if he had meant such special strengthening? The strengthening is to concern the *whole* inner man; hence the reference to a single faculty of the mind (Olshausen refers δυνάμει primarily to the *will*) has no ground in the context. Others have explained it *adverbially: in a powerful manner.*[8] In this way δύναμις would be power, which is applied *on the part of the strengthener.*[9] But our interpretation better accords with the contrast of ἐκκακεῖν, which implies a want of power *on the part of the readers.* — εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον] εἰς, not for ἐν,[10] but *in reference to the inner man*, containing the more precise definition of the relation.[11] *The inner man* (not to be identified with the καινὸς ἄνθρωπος) is the subject of the νοῦς, the rational and moral *ego*,—the essence of man which is conscious of itself as an ethical personality,—which is in harmony with the divine will (Rom. vii. 16, 25); but in the case of the unregenerate is liable to fall under bondage to the power of sin in the flesh (Rom. vii. 23), and even in the case of the regenerate[12] needs constant renewing (iv. 23; Rom. xii. 2) and strengthening by the Spirit of God, whose seat of operation it is (δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος), in order not to be overcome by the sinful desire in the σάρξ, of which the ψυχή, the animal soul-nature, is the living principle (Gal. v. 16 f.). The opposite is ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος (2 Cor. iv. 16), *i.e.*, the man as an outward phenomenon, constituted by the σῶμα τῆς σαρκός (Col. ii. 11), which, by reason of its psychical quality (1 Cor. xv. 44), is the seat of sin and death (Rom. vi. 6, vii. 18, 24). The inner man in and by itself is—by virtue of the moral nature of its νοῦς, as the *Ego* exerting the moral will, and assenting to the divine law (Rom. vii. 20, 22)—directed to the good, yet without the renewing and strengthening by the Holy Spirit too weak for accomplishing, in opposition to the sinful principle in the σάρξ, the good which is perceived, felt, and willed by it (Rom. vii. 15–23). [See Note XXXII., p. 432.] We may add, it is all the less an "*absurd* assertion,"[1] that the conceptions ὁ ἔσω and ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος are derived from Plato's philosophy,[2] inasmuch as for the apostle also the νοῦς in itself is the moral faculty of thinking and willing in man ; inasmuch, further, as the Platonic dichotomy of the human soul-life into πνεῦμα (νοῦς) and ψυχή is found also in Paul (1 Thess. v. 23 ; comp. Heb. iv. 12), and inasmuch as the Platonic expressions had become *popular* (comp. also 1 Pet. iii. 4), so that with the apostle the Platonism of that mode of conception and expression by no means needed to be a *conscious* one, or to imply an *acquaintance* with the Platonic philosophy as such. [See Note XXXIII., p. 432.]

---

[1] Chrysostom, Calvin, Zanchius, and others.

[2] Estius.

[3] Michaelis.

[4] Reiche.

[5] Grotius, Koppe, and others.

[6] Beza, Calvin, Zachariae, and others; comp. Matthies, Holzhausen, Olshausen.

[7] Comp. ἰσχύειν τοῖς σώμασι, Xen. *Mem.* ii. 7. 7.

[8] Beza, Vater, Rückert, Matthies. See Bos, ed. Schaef. p. 743; Matthiae, p. 897.

[9] Comp. Xen. *Cyr.* i. 2. 2.

[10] Vulgate, Beza, and others.

[11] See Kühner, II. § 557, note I.

[12] It must be decided exclusively by the *connection* on each occasion, whether (as here and 2 Cor. iv. 16; comp. 1 Pet. iii. 4) the inner man of the regenerate is intended, or that of the unregenerate (Rom. vii. 22). The man is regenerate, however (in opposition to the evasive view in Delitzsch, *Psych.* p. 380 f.), only of water and the Spirit (Tit. iii. 5).

Ver. 17. Κατοικῆσαι κ.τ.λ.] Parallel to δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι, etc., which "*declarat, quale sit* interioris hominis robur," "declares the nature of that strength which belongs to the inner man," Calvin. According to Rückert, something *different* from what forms the object of the first petition is here prayed for, and there is a climax. In this way we should have, in the absence of a connecting particle, to take the infinitive, with de Wette, as the infinitive of the aim ; but the circumstance that with Christians the being strengthened by the Spirit, who is indeed the Spirit of Christ, cannot at all be thought of as *different* from the indwelling of Christ (Rom. viii. 9, 10 ; 2 Cor. xii. 9 ; Phil. iv. 13 ; Rom. xv. 17 f.), and the subsequent ἐῤῥιζ. κ. τεθεμ., which manifestly further expresses the conception of the κραταιωθῆναι, decide for the former view. The *explanatory* element, however, lies in the emphatically prefixed κατοικῆσαι : that Christ *may take up His abode* by means of faith in your hearts. In the Holy Spirit, namely, which is the Spirit of Christ (see on Rom. viii. 9, 10 ; Gal. ii. 20, iv. 6 ; 2 Cor. iii. 17), Christ fulfils the promise of His spiritual presence in the hearts (John xiv. 23 ; comp. above, on ii. 17 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 5), in which faith is the appropriating instrument on the part of man (hence διὰ τῆς πίστεως). Where thus there is a κραταιωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, there is also to be found a κατοικῆσαι of Christ ; because the former is not possible without a *continuous* activity of Christ in the hearts. Opposed to the κατοικῆσαι of Christ in the hearts is a transitory (πρόσκαιρος) reception of the Holy Spirit (Gal. iii. 3). A more precise definition, by virtue of which the clause κατοικῆσαι κ.τ.λ. may in reality be an explanatory clause to that which precedes, is thus before us, namely, in the prefixed emphatic κατοικῆσαι itself. This in opposition to Harless and Olshausen, who find this more precise definition only in the following ἐν ἀγ. ἐῤῥιζ. κ. τεθεμ. — On κατοικεῖν in the spiritual sense, comp. Col. i. 19, ii. 9 ; Jas. iv. 5 ; 2 Pet. iii. 13 ; *Test. XII. Patr.* pp. 652, 734 ; and the passages in Theile, *ad Jac.* p. 220. The conception of the *temple*, however, is not found here ; for the temple would be the dwelling of *God*, and Christ the corner-stone, ii. 20 ff.

---

[1] Harless.

[2] See the passages from Plato, Plotinus, and Philo, in Wetstein, and Fritzsche on Rom. vii. 22.

Ver. 18. Ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐῤῥιζ. κ. τεθεμ.] is not to be separated by interpunction from the following ἵνα, because it belongs to ἵνα κ.τ.λ. :[1] *in order that, rooted and grounded in love, ye may be able*, etc. Thus the *aim* of the two preceding parallel infinitive clauses is expressed, and the emphatically prefixed ἐν ἀγ. ἐῤῥιζ. κ. τεθεμ. is quite in keeping with the Pauline doctrine of the πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη, Gal. v. 6 ; 1 Cor. xiii. Through the strengthening of their inner man by means of the Spirit, through the κατοικῆσαι of Christ in their hearts, the readers are to become established in love, and, having been established in love, are able to comprehend the greatness of the love of Christ. How often ἵνα and other conjunctions follow a part of the sentence which is with special emphasis prefixed, no matter whether that part of the sentence be subject or object (Rom. xi. 31 ; 2 Cor. ii. 4 ; 2 Thess. ii. 7 ; Acts xix. 4 ; Gal. ii. 10, *al.*), may be seen in Fritzsche,[2] Buttmann.[3] Comp. on Gal. ii. 10.[4] ἐν ἀγ. ἐῤῥιζ. κ. τεθεμ. is, on the other hand, connected with *what precedes* by Chrysostom, Erasmus, Castalio, Luther, Estius, Er. Schmid, Michaelis, Morus, Koppe, and others, including Rückert, Matthies, Harless, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Bleek, holding that it attaches itself, with abnormal employment of case, predicatively to ἐν ταῖς καρδ. ὑμῶν.[5] To the abnormal nominative of the construction continued in participles there would be in itself nothing to object ;[6] but here the *perfect* participles are opposed to this, since they in fact would express not the state into which the readers *are to come*,[7] but the state in which they already *are*,[8] the state which is *presupposed* as predicate of the readers.[9] But to the desire that the readers *might be* strengthened, and that Christ *might make* His dwelling in their hearts, the presupposition that they *were already* ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐῤῥιζωμένοι would stand in quite illogical relation. *Present* participles would be logically necessary : "inasmuch as ye *are being* confirmed in love," namely, by the fact that Christ takes up His dwelling in you. De Wette, on the other hand, is wrong in appealing to Col. ii. 7, where, indeed, in the case of ἐῤῥιζωμένοι the having received Christ appears as having already preceded. — ἐν ἀγάπῃ] is, in accordance with the following figures, the *soil* in which the readers were rooted and grounded, namely, in *love*, the *effect* of faith, Christian *brotherly love ;* hence there is no reason in the relation of faith to love[1] for supplying after ἐῤῥιζ. κ. τεθεμ., with Holzhausen and Harless, ἐν Χριστῷ, which is not even required by the anarthrous ἀγάπῃ; for without an article (*in amando*, "in loving"), it has "*vim quasi verbi*," "as it were the force of a verb," Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 1. 9. Such a supplement is, however, the more arbitrary, inasmuch as there is already a definition by ἐν ; consequently the reader could not light upon the idea of supplying such in thought. ἐν ἀγ. ἐῤῥιζ. κ. τεθεμ. is *prefixed* with emphasis, because only the *loving* soul is in a position to recognize the love of Christ (comp. 1 John iv. 7 ff.). Erroneously Beza says : "charitatem intellige, *qua diligimur a Deo*," "understand charity, whereby we are beloved of God,"[2] and Bengel holds that the love *of Christ*, ver. 19, is meant ; against which in the very mention of love along with faith (i. 15 ; 1 Cor. xiii.) the absence of a genitival definition is decisive. [See Note XXXIV., p. 432 seq.] — ἐῤῥιζ. καὶ τεθεμελ.] a twofold figurative indication of the sense : *steadfast and enduring.* Paul, in the vivacity of his imagination, conceives to himself the congregation of his readers as a *plant* (comp. Matt. xiii. 3 ff.), perhaps a *tree* (Matt. vii. 17), and at the same time as a *building*. Comp. Col. ii. 7 ; 1 Cor. iii. 9. Passages from profane literature for the tropical usage of both words may be seen in Raphel, *Herod.* p. 534 ; Bos, *Exerc.* p. 183 ; Wetstein, p. 248.[3] — ἐξισχύσητε] *ye may be fully able* (Ecclus. vii. 6 ; Plut. *Mor.* p. 801 E ; Strabo, xvii. p. 788). — καταλαβέσθαι] *to apprehend*, κατανοεῖν. Comp. Acts iv. 13, x. 34, xxv. 25 ; Josephus, *Antt.* viii. 6. 5, with classical writers in the active. Comp. on John i. 5. Strangely at variance with the context (because the object is not suited thereto), Holzhausen takes it to mean *to lay hold of*, as a *prize in the games* (1 Cor. ix. 24 ; Phil. iii. 12). — σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἁγίοις] The highest and most precious knowledge (Phil. iii. 8) Paul can desire only as a common possession of *all* Christians ; individuals, for whom he wishes it, are to have it in communion with *all ;* as the *knowledge of the ground of salvation*, so the attaining of the *salvation itself* (Acts xx. 32). — τί τὸ πλάτος κ.τ.λ.] Sensuous illustration (arbitrarily declared by de Wette to be "hardly" in keeping with the Pauline style) of the idea : *how great in every relation.* The deeply affected mind with its poetico-imaginative intuition looks upon the *metaphysical* magnitude as a *physical*, *mathematical* one, σωματικοῖς σχήμασι, "in corporeal characters,"[4] extending on every side. Comp. Job xi. 7–9. The many modes of interpreting the several dimensions in the older expositors may be seen in Cornelius à Lapide and Calovius. *Every* special attempt at interpretation is unpsychological, and only gives scope to that caprice which profanes by dissecting the outpouring of enthusiasm.[1] *Of what, however, are these dimensions predicated?* Not of the *Christian church*, as the spiritual *temple of God*, Rev. xxi. 16,[2] which is at variance with the context; inasmuch as a temple is not spoken of either before or after (*τεθεμελιωμένοι . . . τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ* !). Not of the *work of redemption*,[3] because, after a new portion of the discourse is commenced with ver. 14, the *μυστήριον* is not again mentioned; hence also not of the *mystery of the cross*, in connection with which marvellous allegories are drawn by Augustine and Estius from the *figure* of the cross.[4] Not of the *love of God* to us;[5] because previously *ἐν ἀγάπῃ* does not apply to this love. Not of the "*divine gracious nature*,"[6] which would only be correct if the predicates were exclusive attributes of the divine nature, so that, as a matter of course, the latter would suggest itself as the subject. Not of the *wisdom of God*, which de Wette quite irrelevantly introduces from Col. ii. 3; Job xi. 8. The *love of Christ* to men, ver. 19, is the subject,[7] the boundless greatness of which is depicted.[8] Instead, namely, of the apostle adding *τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ* immediately after *ὕψος* and thus bringing to a close the majestic flow of his discourse, now, when he has written as far as *ὕψος*, there first presents itself to his lively conception the—as regards sense, *climactically* parallel to the just expressed *καταλαβέσθαι . . . ὕψος*—oxymoron *γνῶναι τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως*; he appends this, and can now no longer express the love of Christ in the genitive, so that *τὸ πλάτος . . . ὕψος* remains *without* a genitive, but lays claim to its genitival definition as self-evident from the ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ immediately following.

---

[1] Comp. Lachmann.

[2] *Ad Rom.* II. p. 541.

[3] *Neut. Gr.* p. 333 [E. T. 389].

[4] This construction is here followed by Beza, Cajetanus, Camerarius, Heinsius, Grotius, Calixtus, Semler, Storr, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Meier, Schenkel, and others, including Winer, § 63, 1, and Buttmann [E. T. 299]. Comp. already Photius in Oecumenius.

[5] Harless holds that the changing of the construction is here, as Col. ii. 2, the more natural, inasmuch as the predicate is equally applicable to καρδίαις and ὑμῶν, and as an essential element must stand forth independently.

[6] See already Photius in Oecumenius, *ad loc.* ; Winer, p. 505, Buttmann, p. 256 [E. T. 299].

[7] "Ita ut in amore sitis stabiles," "That ye may be stable in love," Morus.

[8] So also Rückert.

[9] So Harless and Olshausen.

---

[1] Calvin already aptly remarks : "neque enim disputat P., *ubi salus nostra fundata sit* . . . sed quam firma et tenax debeat in nobis esse caritas," "For Paul does not dispute as to where our love is founded . . . but how firm and tenacious love in us should be" (rather : "quam firmi et tenaces debeamus esse in caritate," "How firm and tenacious we should be in love").

[2] So also Calovius, Wolf, and others.

[3] Comp. the Fathers in Suicer's *Thes.* II. p. 905.

[4] Chrysostom.

---

[1] By way of example, we subjoin some of these modes of explanation, *e.g.*, Oecumenius; it is indicated that redemption and the knowledge of Christ were foreordained from eternity (μῆκος), extend to all (πλάτος), reach even to hell in their efficacy (βάθος), and that Christ has ascended above the heavens (ὕψος). Erasmus, *Paraphr.*: "*altitudine* ad angelos usque se proferens, *profunditate* ad inferos usque penetrans, *longitudine* ac *latitudine* ad omnes hujus mundi plagas sese dilatans." "*in height* reaching to the angels, *in depth* penetrating to hell, *in length and breadth* stretching itself to all the regions of this world." Grotius, "*latissime* se effundit in omnes homines, et in *longum*, *i.e.*, in omnia saecula se extendit, et ex *infima* depressione hominem liberat, et in loca *suprema* evehit," "*Most widely* does it diffuse itself towards all men, and in *its length* it extends to all nations, and in its *depth* frees man from the *lowest* depression, and elevates him to the *highest* places." For other instances, see Calovius.

[2] Heinsius, Homberg, Wolf, Michaelis, Cramer, Koppe, and others; Comp. Bengel.

[3] Chrysostom: τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν οἰκονομηθέν, Theophylact, Oecumemius, Theodoret, Beza, Piscator, Zanchius, Calovius, and others, including Rückert, Meier, Harless, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek.

[4] According to Estius, the *length* applies to the upright beam of the cross as far as the cross-beam; the *breadth*, to the cross-beam; the *height*, to the portion projecting above the cross-beam; the *depth*, to the portion fixed in the ground. He comprehends the *length* of the cross, who perceives that from the beginning to the end of time no one is justified save by the cross; the *breadth*, who reflects that the church in all the earth has come forth from the side of Christ; the *height*, who ponders the sublimity of the glory in heaven obtained though Christ; the *depth*, who contemplates the mystery of the divine election of grace, and is thereby led to the utterance, Rom. xi. 32! This as a warning instance how even the better exegetes, when they give the reins to subjectivity, may lose themselves in the most absurd attempts at interpretation.

[5] Chrysostom: τὸ μέγεθος τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ, "the greatness of God's love." Theodore of Mopsuestia, Erasmus, Vatablus, Grotius, Baumgarten, Flatt.

[6] Matthies.

[7] Castalio, Calvin, Calixtus, Zachariae, Morus, Storr, Rosenmüller, Holzhausen.

[8] Comp. Luther: "that nothing is so broad, long, deep, high, as to be beyond the power and help of Christ."

Ver. 19. Γνῶναι] Parallel to καταλαβέσθαι. — τέ] *and*, denotes, in a repetition of words of corresponding signification (καταλαβέσθαι . . . γνῶναι), the harmony, the symmetrical relation of the elements in question ;[1] hence we have the less to assume a *climax* in connection with γνῶναί τε κ.τ.λ., since this must have been hinted at least by γνῶναι δέ, or more clearly by μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ γνῶναι, or the like. — τὴν ὑπερβάλλ. τῆς γνώσεως] The oxymoron (" suavissima haec quasi correctio est," " This is a very charming correction, so to speak," Bengel) lies in the fact that an *adequate* knowledge of the love of Christ transcends human capacity, but the *relative* knowledge of the same opens up in a higher degree, the more the heart is filled with the Spirit of Christ, and thereby is itself strengthened in loving (vv. 17, 18), —which knowledge is not of the *discursive* kind, but that which has its basis in the *consciousness of experience.* Theodore of Mopsuestia aptly says : τὸ γνῶναι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπολαῦσαι λέγει, ἐπὶ πραγμάτων εἰπὼν τὴν γνῶσιν, ὡς ἐν ψαλμῷ τὸ ἐγνώρισάς μοι ὁδοὺς ζωῆς, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν ἀπολαύσει με τῆς ζωῆς κατέστησας, "He says 'to know,' instead of 'to enjoy,' speaking of knowledge in respect to things, as in the Psalm, 'Thou hast made known to me the ways of life,' instead of 'Thou hast put me in the enjoyment of life.'" The *genitive* τῆς γνώσεως is dependent on the comparative ὑπερβάλλουσαν,[2] not upon ἀγάπην, from which construction the reading of Jerome,[3] ἀγάπην τῆς γνώσεως, has arisen, which in any case—even though we should understand, with Grotius, the love (to God and one's neighbor) *which flows from the knowledge of Christ*—yields an inappropriate sense, and obliterates the oxymoron. — ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ] genitive *of the subject.* It is the love of Christ *to us* (Rom. viii. 35), shown in His atoning death (Gal. ii. 20 ; Rom. v. 6 f., *al.*). Incorrect (although still unhappily enough defended by Holzhausen) is the view of Luther, 1545 :[4] "that *to love Christ* is much better than all knowledge." At variance with the words, since τὴν ὑπερβ. τῆς γνώς. can only be taken *adjectively ;* and at variance with the context, since love *to* Christ is not spoken of in the whole connection. Comp., on the other hand, vv. 8, 12. — ἵνα πληρωθῆτε κ.τ.λ.] Aim of the ἐξισθύειν καταλαβέσθαι . . . Χριστοῦ : *in order that ye may be filled up to the whole fulness of God.* τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ (comp. iv. 13, πλήρωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ) is, according to the context, which speaks of the *operationes gratiae*, "operation of grace" (vv. 16–18, 20), the *charismatic* fulness, which is bestowed by God. Hence the sense : *in order that ye may be filled with divine gifts of grace to such extent, that the whole fulness of them* (πᾶν has the emphasis) *shall have passed over upon you.* πλήρωμα namely, the definite meaning of which is gathered from the context (comp. on i. 10, i. 23), has, by virtue of its first signification : *id quo res impletur*, "that with which a thing is filled," often also the derived general signification of *copia*, πλοῦτος, πλῆθος, because that, by which a space is made full, appears as *copiously* present.

---

[1] Hartung, *Partikellehre*, I. p. 105.

[2] Hom. *Il.* xxiii. 847 ; Plat. *Gorg.* p. 475 C ; Bernhardy, p. 170.

[3] Also A, 74, 115, *Al.*, Ar. p.

[4] In the earlier editions he had correctly : *the love of Christ, which yet surpasses all knowledge.*

So Song of Sol. v. 12 : *πληρώματα ὑδάτων*, Rom. xv. 29 : *πλήρωμα εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ*, Eph. iv. 13 ;[1] Eur. *Ion.* 664 : *φίλων πλήρωμα.* Comp. Hesychius : *πλήρωμα· πλῆθος*, Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 471. Quite so the German *Fülle.* Grotius takes it actively, thus as equivalent to *πλὴρωσις*, *making full:* "donis, *quibus Deus implere solet* homines," "the gifts wherewith God is accustomed to fill men." This is not, indeed, at variance with linguistic usage (see on i. 10), but less simple, inasmuch as the passive *πληρωθῆτε* most naturally makes us assume for *πλήρωμα* also the passive notion, namely, that of the *experienced* divine fulness of gifts. *Others*, retaining the signification : *id quo res impletur*, "that wherewith a thing is filled," but not the signification *copia*, "fulness," derived therefrom, have assumed as the meaning : the *perfection* of God. See Chrysostom : *πληροῦσθαι πάσης ἀρετῆς ἧς πλήρης ἐστιν ὁ Θεός*, "to be filled with all the virtue whereof God is full." Comp. Oecumenius and others. Recently so Rückert : "in order that you may be continually more filled with all perfection, until you have finally attained to all the *fulness of the divine perfection.*" Comp. Olshausen. But *this* goal cannot possibly be thought of by Paul as one to be realized in the temporal life (1 Cor. xiii. 10–12). This also in opposition to Matthies, who understands the infinite fulness of the—in grace, truth, etc., inexhaustible—essence of God, which has become manifest in Christ. Harless here, too (but see on i. 23), will have the *gracious presence of the divine δόξα*, with which God fills His people, to be meant ; just as Holzhausen make us think of the *Shechinah* filling the temple.[2] The *church*, however, is not according to the context here meant by *πλήρωμα* ;[3] and the turgid and involved analysis given by Schenkel in this sense is quite an arbitrary importation of meaning,[4] since *εἰς π. τ. πλήρ. τ. Θ.* can only state simply that the *πληρωθῆναι* is to be a *full* one, consequently *πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα* must be the totality of that which is *communicated* by the *πληρωθῆναι.* — *εἰς*] does not stand for *ἐν*,[5] and does not signify either : *into the very* (becoming merged into), as Matthies, nor *up towards*, as Schenkel explains it, to which *πλήρωμα* is not suitable ; but it indicates *the quantitative goal* of the fulfilment.[6]

Vv. 20, 21. That which is strictly speaking the prayer, the petition, is at an end ; but the confidence in the Almighty, who can still do far more, draws forth from the praying heart a right full and solemn ascription of praise, with the fulness of which that of Rom. xvi. 25–27 is to be compared. — *ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιῆσαι*] to be taken together. *To be able to do beyond all, i.e., more than all* is a *popular* expression of the *very highest active power ;* so that *πάντα* is quite unlimited, and it is not, with Grotius, arbitrarily to be limited by *quae hactenus visa sunt*, "what has hitherto been seen." This *ὑπὲρ πάντα* does not belong to *δυναμένῳ*,[7] because otherwise *ποιῆσαι* would be superfluous ; nor does ὑπέρ stand *adverbially* (2 Cor. xi. 23), as Bengel would have it, which could not occur to any reader on account of the πάντα standing beside it. There is nothing at which the action of God would have its *limit ;* He can do still more. — ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν αἰτούμ. ἢ νοοῦμ.] a more precise definition to the universal and indefinite ὑπὲρ πάντα, specializing and at the same time enhancing the notion of ὑπέρ : *above measure more than what we ask or understand.* According to Rückert, ὧν αἰτούμ. has reference to πάντα : Paul namely, instead of adding ὧν αἰτούμ. immediately after πάντα, has first for the strengthening of the ὑπέρ introduced the additional ὑπερεκπερ., and now must needs annex in the genitive what ought properly, as construed with πάντα, to follow in the accusative. A course in itself quite unnecessary ; and if the apostle had been concerned only about a strengthening of the ὑπέρ, and he had, in using πάντα, already had ἃ αἰτούμ. in his mind, he must have written after ὑπερεκπερ. : πάντων ἃ αἰτούμ. ; so that the sense would be: *more than all* (which we ask, etc.), *exceedingly more than all,* which we ask, etc. — ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ] is, with the exception of 1 Thess. iii. 10, v. 13 (Elz.), codd. at Dan. iii. 22, nowhere else preserved.[1] The frequent, and in part bold, compounds with ὑπέρ used by Paul are at such places in keeping with the intensity of his pious feeling, which struggles after adequate expression. — ὧν, for τούτων ἅ, is genitive of *comparison.*[2] — ἤ] Whether our asking *or* our apprehending be regarded, the one as the other is infinitely surpassed by God's active power. "*Cogitatio* latius patet quam *preces ;* gradatio," "*Thought* takes a wider range than *prayers ;* a gradation," Bengel. — τὴν ἐνεργουμ.] not *passive,*"[3] but *middle.* See on Gal. v. 6. — ἐν ἡμῖν] *in our minds,* appeal to the consciousness of experience with regard to the divine power, which is at work in the continued enlightenment and whole Christian endowment of the inner man.[4] Michaelis arbitrarily refers it to the *miraculous gifts,* which in fact would be applicable only to individuals.

---

[1] Not even in John i. 16, where, rather, the context (ver. 14 : *πλήρης χάριτος κ.τ.λ.*) demands the first signification : *that, of which Christ is full.*

[2] Comp. Baumgarten, Michaelis.

[3] Koppe, Stolz, and others.

[4] *The world-whole* (?) *fulfilling itself* (?) *in God*, i.e., *completing itself unto the expression of the highest perfection, reflecting itself in the church* (?), *in so far as there is no longer found in it any want, any kind of defect.*" A complication of ideas, of which the clear-headed rational Paul was quite incapable.

[5] Grotius, Estius, Rosenmüller.

[6] Matthiae, p. 1348.

[7] Holzhausen.

Ver. 21. αὐτῷ] pointing back with rhetorical emphasis.[5] — ἡ δόξα] *sc.* εἴη : *the befitting honor.* Comp. Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27 ; Gal. i. 5 ; Phil. iv. 20. Certainly God *has* the glory (i. 17), from which fact Harless explains the article ; but it is not of *this* that the doxologies speak, not of this fact being *testified* to God, but of His *receiving* the *human* praise, which to Him pertains (Rev. iv. 11). Compare the conception, δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ, Luke xvii. 18 ; Acts xii. 23 ; John ix. 24 ; Rom. iv. 20 ; Rev. iv. 9. — ἐν τῇ ἐκκλ. ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰ.] not to be taken together,[6] against which we may decidedly urge, not indeed the want of the article,—since ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐν Χριστῷ, the *Christian* church, might be combined as *one* idea in contradistinction from the Jewish, or any other ἐκκλησία whatever,—but the utter superfluousness of this distinguishing designation ; for that ἡ ἐκκλησία was the *Christian* church, the ἐκκλησία κατ᾽ἐξοχήν, "*pre-eminently,*" was self-evident. Rather is ἐν τῇ ἐκκλ. the *outward domain* in which God is to be praised, and ἐν Χριστῷ the *spiritual sphere* in which this ascription of praise is to take place; for not outside of Christ, but *in Christ*—as the specific element of faith, in which the pious life-activity of the Christian moves—does he praise God. Comp. vv. 5, 20. Allied, but not identical (in opposition to Grotius and others), is the conception διὰ Χριστοῦ, Rom. i. 8, vii. 25. Both conceptions: Col. iii. 17.—εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς κ.τ.λ.] *unto all generations of the world-age of world-ages.*[1] This *cumulation* of the expressions is solemn. The αἰὼν τῶν αἰώνων denotes *the eternal world-period beginning with the Parousia*, the αἰὼν μέλλων, conceived of as the *superlativum*, "*superlative*," of all world-periods,[2] in so far as it, just as the last and eternal one, transcends all other αἰῶνες since the beginning of the world. Comp. Dan. vii. 18; 3 Esdr. iv. 38. The *plural* expression οἱ αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων (Gal. i. 5; Phil. iv. 20, *al.*) is not different as to the thing intended, but is so as to the conception; since in it the Messianic period, although equally thought of (comp. also on Luke i. 50) as the superlative of all the αἰῶνες, is not thought of in its *unity* without distinction, but as a continuous series of *several* periods: consequently not as a single totality, as in the case of ὁ αἰών, but according to the several constituent parts, which collectively form the whole of the Messianic eternity,—in short, not as *the time of times*, as in our passage, but as *the times of times.* [See Note XXXV., p. 433.] By εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς κ.τ.λ. the thought is expressed, that the indicated ascription of praise to God will *extend to* all the *generations* of the (nigh) Messianic world-period, *i.e.*, that this ascription of praise in the church is to endure not only up to the Parousia, but then also ever onward from generation to generation in the Messianic aeon,—consequently to last not merely ἐς τὸ παρόν, "for the present," but also ἐς τὸ ἀΐδιον, "forever." On γενεά, *generation* (three of which about = 100 years), comp. Acts xiv. 16, and the passages from the LXX. and Apocrypha in Schleusner's *Thes.;* from Greek writers, in Wessel.[3] The designation of the successive time-spaces of the everlasting Messianic αἰών by γενεαί, is derived from the lapse of time in the pre-Messianic world-period—in which with the changing generations one age of man ever succeeds another—by virtue of a certain anthropological mode of regarding eternity. Of the *church*, however, it is presupposed that she herself (and so, too, will it be with her praising of God) endures on into the everlasting αἰών, but not that she has still a very long *temporal* duration *before* the Parousia, according to which de Wette has here found a contradiction to the apostle's expectation elsewhere of the nearness of the Parousia. The Parousia brings for the ἐκκλησία not the end, but the consummation. Hofmann,[4] retaining καί before ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. (see the critical remarks), would have εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεάς κ.τ.λ., to belong only to ἐν Χρ. Ἰ., and not to ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ; for only at present and upon earth does the glorification of God take place *in the church*, but *in Christ* it takes place eternally. Incorrectly, because even the temporal glorification does not take place otherwise than *ἐν* Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, consequently the *καί* would have had its logical position only *after* Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. If *καί* were genuine, it would not be equivalent to *δέ*, as would need to be assumed on Hofmann's view, but it would be *et quidem, idque*, "and indeed," "and that too," however superfluous and cumbrous such a stress laid on it might be. According to Baur, p. 433, there meets us again here the Gnostic idea of the *αἰῶνες*, in accordance with which they, "as the *γενεαὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων*, are the aeons in *the* sense, in which God Himself, as the extra-temporal unity of time, individualizes Himself in the aeons as the elements of self-unfolding time." In this way one may *over-urge* Gnosticism.

---

[1] Comp., however, ὑπερεκπερισσῶς, 1 Thess. v. 13 ; Clem. *Cor.* I. 20 ; λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ, Mark vi. 51 ; ὑπερπερισσῶς, Mark vii. 37 ; ὑπερπερισσεύω, Rom. v. 20 ; 2 Cor. vii. 4.

[2] See Bernhardy, p. 139.

[3] Estius.

[4] Chrysostom aptly remarks that this, too, we should neither have asked nor hoped.

[5] See Schaef. *Melet.* p. 84 ; Kühner, II., p. 330.

[6] Luther, Michaelis, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Holzhausen, Meier, Olshausen.

---

[1] "αἰῶνες, periodi oeconomiae divinae ab una quasi scena ad aliam decurrentes," "periods of the divine economy extending, as it were, from one scene to another," Bengel.

[2] Winer, p. 220.

[3] *Ad Diod.* I. 24.

[4] *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 127.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

XXIX. Ver. 7. *διάκονος*.

"The meanings of *διάκονος* and *ὑπηρέτης* are much more nearly allied ; they do in fact continuously run into one another, and there are a multitude of occasions on which they might be promiscuously used ; the more official character of the *ὑπηρέτης* is the point in which the distinction between them resides." Trench's Synonyms of the N. T., Second Series, p. 57.

XXX. Ver. 10. *διά τῆς ἐκκλησίας*.

Eadie develops this thought with great eloquence : "The church teaches the angelic hosts. They have seen much of God's working—many a sun lighted up, and many a world launched into its orbit. They have been delighted with the solution of many a problem and the development of many a mystery. But in the proclamation of the Gospel to the Gentiles, with its strange preparations ; various agencies and stupendous effects—involving the origination and extinction of Judaism, the Incarnation and the Atonement, the manger and the cross, the spread of the Greek language and the triumph of the Roman arms, 'these principalities and powers in heavenly places' beheld with rapture other and brighter phases of a wisdom which had often dazzled them by its brilliant and profound versatility, and surprised and entranced them by the infinite fulness of the love which prompts it, and of the power which itself directs and controls. The events that have transpired in the church on earth are the means of augmenting the information of those pure and exalted beings who encircle the throne of God. 1 Tim. iii. 16 ; 1 Pet. i. 12."

XXXI. Ver. 15. *πᾶσα πατριὰ κ.τ.λ.*

The exact meaning of this passage is, that as every clan or family bears the name of its ancestor (as, for example, in modern times Luther and Washington are the names of more remote ancestors of the individuals so well known to the world), so every *patria* is simply a perpetuation of the name of the *pater* whence it ultimately springs. Wherever the *patria* is found its paternity is at once indicated. If we find those who are members of a *patria*, "they lose the cold and official name of subjects in the familiar and endearing appellation of sons, and they are united to one another not dimly and unconsciously, as different products of the same divine workmanship, but they merge into one family—'all they are brethren.' Every πατρία must surely possess unbounded confidence in the benignity and protection of the πατήρ, and to Him, therefore, the prayer of the apostle is directed" (Eadie).

XXXII. Ver. 16. τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον. (1).

The higher powers of the unregenerate man are here regarded by Meyer as not entirely dead with respect to spiritual things; they are only impaired, directed to the good, but without the Holy Spirit too weak to effect anything. Cf. Weiss, Bibl. Theol. This is perfectly consistent with Meyer's interpretation of chap. ii. 1, which see, and, on the other side, Note XVI., p. 398 seq. To the student of church history the name of a serious error in the early church will be readily suggested. Yet Dr. Riddle is right in maintaining that Dr. Hodge goes too far in classifying all interpretations that insist upon a distinction between "the inner man" and "the new man," as semi-Pelagian. "The inner man" is the sphere in which "the new man" is developed, "the central point of the human personality" (Harless, Chr. Ethics, p. 195), "not the pure in antithesis to the impure, but only that in the regenerate man which daily experiences renewal . . . In antithesis to the externality of the worldly life, it is the inner man upon which the grace of God lays hold, the inner man which daily is renewed while the outward man perishes" (Harless on Eph. iii. 16). Hence in its application, as here, it may often by synecdoche be almost identical with "the new man." Elsewhere ὁ ἔσω (ἔσωθεν) ἄνθρωπος certainly designates the regenerate internal nature of man (2 Cor. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 16; cf. 1 Pet. iii. 4), although even there not in itself, but only in respect of the connection" (Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychology, p. 446). So Ellicott, Eadie, Braune.

XXXIII. Ver. 16. τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον. (2).

The relation of the expression to the Platonic philosophy is well indicated by Cremer (Lexicon, p. 104 sq.): "This Platonic reflection, with its identification of the intellectual and moral nature, may be regarded as the expression, in Platonic form, of a presentiment of the truth, such as readily dawns on the human mind; but we must not, therefore, suppose that St. Paul's expression had this basis—it was the outcome rather of his own moral and religious experience in its harmony with the words of divine revelation."

XXXIV. Ver. 18. ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

Westcott and Hort attach this clause to the preceding verse. As to Meyer's interpretation: "The absence of the article is unduly pressed, both by Meyer (in amando), and Harl. (*subjective* love, man's love to Christ), such omissions in the case of abstract nouns, especially when preceded by prepositions, being not uncommon in the N. T., see Winer's Gr. § 19. 1, p. 109, and comp. Middleton, *Gr. Art.* vi. 1, p. 98 (ed. Rose)." (Ellicott). So Eadie, in almost the same words, who adds: "But the entire context proves that the love referred to is the grace of love. One would have expected a genitive of possession, if ἀγάπη were not predicated of the persons themselves—if it were not a feeling in their hearts. It is a clumsy and equivocal exegesis to comprise under the term both

Christ's love to us and our love to Christ. Nor can we accede to Meyer, who seems to restrict it to brother-love ; for if it be the grace of love which is here specified, then it is love to Christ and to every creature that bears His image. . . . This love is the root and foundation of Christian character, as all advancement is connected with its existence and exercise. 'He prayeth well who loveth well.' Love is the fundamental grace.'' Yet only as the fruit of faith, as the preceding verse shows.

XXXV. Ver. 21. *τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων.*

"The addition of the genitive strengthens the idea. It is a periphrasis for the superlative, Matthiae, § 430" (Cremer). "Harless finds a difference between the two expressions *αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων* and *αἰὼν τῶν αἰώνων*, the former being rather *extensive*, and conveying the idea of *πάντες αἰῶνες*, the latter being rather *intensive*, and more strictly in accordance with the Hebrew superlative. This is ingenious, but apparently of doubtful application, as in actual practice the difference between the two expressions is hardly appreciable'' (Ellicott). "Eternity is conceived as containing ages, just as our 'age' contains years ; and then those ages are thought of as made up, like ours, of generations. Like the similar expression *αἰῶνες τῶν αἰῶνων*, it is used by a transfer of what we know in time, to express imperfectly and indeed improperly the idea of eternity'' (Alford).

CHAPTER IV.

VER. 6. After *πᾶσιν* Elz. has, with min. Chrys. Theodoret, *ὑμῖν*; for which D E F G K L and many min., also several vss. and Fathers, read *ἡμῖν*. So Griesb. and Scholz. But *neither* pronoun is present in A B C ℵ and several min. vss. and Fathers. The pronouns are exegetic additions, designed to secure the reference of *πάντων, πάντων, πᾶσιν* to the Christians. — Ver. 7. The article of *χάρις* is wanting in B D* F G L, Dam. min. Deleted by Lachm. [Treg.] But it was more easily absorbed through the preceding H than brought in through writing it twice; and *in its favor* tell the readings *ἡ χάρις αὕτη* in C** 10, 31, Cyr., and *ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ* in Aeth., in which the article is *glossed.* — Ver. 8. Before *ἔδωκε* Elz. Scholz, and Tisch. have *καί*, which has against it A C** D* E F G ℵ* 17, Copt. Slav. ant. Vulg. It. and several Latin Fathers, and hence is suspected by Griesb., and deleted by Lachm. [and Tisch.] But considerable witnesses still remain *in favor of καί*; and since the LXX. does *not* have it at Ps. lxviii. 19, the omission seems to have taken place in accordance with the LXX. — Ver. 9. After *κατέβη* Elz. has *πρῶτον*, in opposition to decisive witnesses, although defended by Reiche. A more precisely defining addition, as is also *μέρη* in Elz. after *κατώτ.* Less weighty authority, it is true, testifies against this *μέρη* (hence it is retained not only by Reiche, but also by Lachm. Scholz, Rück. [Hof. Braune, West. and Hort]), but it betrays itself as a glossing product of the very old explanation of the descent into hell, in order to designate the place whither Christ descended as *subterranean.* — Ver. 15. Instead of *ὁ Χριστός*, A B C ℵ* min. Fathers have merely *Χριστός*. So Lachm. and Tisch. [Treg. and West. and Hort]. To be preferred, on account of the oldest MS. attestation. — Ver. 16. *μέρους*] A C, 14, 66 (on margin), Syr. Arr. Copt. Arm. Vulg. and several Fathers have *μέλους*, which, after Grot. Mill, and Bengel, is recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Rück. (not Lachm). An interpretation in accordance with the context. G has *μέτρους*, which likewise testifies in favor of *μέρους*. — Ver. 17. *λοιπά*] is wanting with A B D* F G ℵ, min. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Vulg. It. Clem. Cyr. and Lat. Fathers. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. Rück. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort]. But how naturally might it be omitted, since Paul was speaking to Gentiles who were now *Christians*, and upon a comparison with 1 Thess. iv. 5! — Ver. 18. *ἐσκοτισμένοι*] Lachm. Tisch. [Treg. West. and Hort], read *ἐσκοτωμένοι*, following A B ℵ, Ath. Rightly; the *current* form was brought in. — Ver. 26. The article before *παροργ.*, deleted by Lachm. [Treg. West. and Hort.], is wanting in A B ℵ*, and is more likely to have been added on account of the definite reference in the text, than to have been omitted. — Ver. 27. *μήτε*] All uncials have *μηδέ*. On that account, even apart from the greater linguistic probability, rightly approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Scholz, Rück. and Harless. — Ver. 28. *τὸ ἀγαθὸν ταῖς χερσίν*] Many variations, among which *ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσὶ τὸ ἀγαθόν* (so Lachm. [Tisch. Treg.] and Rück.) is by far the best attested reading (A D E F G ℵ* min. Ar. pol. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Arm.

Vulg. It. Basil, Epiph. Naz. Jer. Aug. Pel.). The shortest readings are : merely τὸ ἀγαθόν with Clem., and merely ταὶς χερσίν with Tertull. Harless (comp. Mill) conjectures that the latter is the original form, and that 1 Cor. iv. 12, Gal. v. 10 gave occasion to glosses. But only 1 Cor. iv. 12 is here parallel, because Gal. vi. 10 does not speak of literal labor. There would hence be more warrant for regarding the simple τὸ ἀγαθόν in Clement as original. But in opposition to this, it may be urged that ταὶς χερσίν is wanting in no other witness, and is in the highest degree appropriate to the connection ; whereas τὸ ἀγαθόν, since the mention is of *manual* labor, might easily appear inappropriate. The true reading accordingly I hold to be ταῖς χερσὶ τὸ ἀγαθόν, which remains, if we delete ἰδίαις in Lachm., as an addition from 1 Cor. iv. 12. And with this agree also B ℵ** Amiat. Ambrosiast., which actually read ταῖς χερσὶ τὸ ἀγαθόν [West. and Hort : ταῖς χερσὶν τὸ ἀγαθόν.] —Ver. 29. χρείας] D* E* F G, 46, Arm. in several codd. of Vulg., codd. of It., Lat. codd. in Jer. and several Fathers : πίστεως. An interpretation. — Ver. 32. δέ] is wanting, no doubt, in B and min. Clar. Germ. Clem. Dam. Oec., and is deleted by Lachm., but was easily dropped out through the last syllable of γίνεσθε. Omitted, it was then in accordance with v. 1 made up for, in many witnesses, by οὖν (D* F G, lect. 6, 14, codd. of It.). — ὑμῖν] Lachm. : ἡμῖν, after B** D E K L, min. Syr. utr. Ar. pol. Sahid. Arm. Chrys. *in comm.*, Theodoret, Theophylact. But ἡμῖν appears an alteration in accordance with v. 2 ; where, no doubt, the variations ὑμᾶς and ὑμῶν are found, but in opposition to so decisive a preponderance of witnesses reading ἡμᾶς and ἡμῶν, that ὑμᾶς and ὑμῶν only become an evidence for the originality of our ὑμῖν.

CONTENTS.—The *paraenetic* portion of the Epistle begins with the general exhortation to the readers to live worthily of their vocation, whereupon, especially, mutual loving forbearance and the preservation of Christian unity are brought prominently forward (vv. 1–3). Thereon follows, vv. 4–16, a detailed exhibition of those relations, which render the preservation of Christian unity a duty, namely—(*a*) that there is one body, one Spirit, etc., vv. 4–6. Further, (*b*) that to every individual is grace given in the measure in which Christ apportions His gift, vv. 7–10. And (*c*) that Christ has given the different teachers, until all should have attained to unity of the faith and of knowledge, in order that dependence on false teaching may cease, and, on the other hand, the truth may be acknowledged in love, and thus all may grow in relation to Christ the head, from whom the whole church, the body, accomplishes in love its organic development to perfection, vv. 11–16. Hereupon the discourse returns to the form of exhortation, namely, that they no longer walk after a Gentile manner (vv. 17–19). They had, indeed, been quite otherwise taught, namely so, as it is truth in Jesus, that they should lay aside the old man, and, on the other hand, should be renewed in their mind and should put on the new man (vv. 20–24). Lastly, thus grounded, there follow the special exhortations no longer to lie, but to speak the truth ; not to sin in anger, etc. ; no longer to steal, but to work, etc. ; to hold no bad discourse, but, etc. ; not to be bitter, passionate, etc., but kind, compassionate, forgiving (vv. 25–32).

Ver. 1. See on vv. 1–6, Winzer, *Commentat.*, Lips. 1839. — παρακαλῶ]

"Parte doctrinae absoluta venit, ut solet, ad adhortationes," "after the doctrinal portion is finished, he comes, according to his custom, to exhortations," Grotius. No doubt, there presently begins again at ver. 4 a *doctrinal* exposition as far as ver. 16, but it is *subservient to* the paraenesis, and is itself pervaded by the paraenetic element (vv. 14, 15). — οὖν] deduces the exhortation from the immediately preceding iii. 21. For a walk in keeping with the vocation, through which one belongs to the church, is what is practically in keeping with the praise of God in the church. The suitableness of this *nearest* reference gives it the preference over the more vague ordinary view, that οὖν draws its inference from the whole contents of the first three chapters. Comp. on Rom. xii. 1. — ἐγὼ ὁ δέσμιος ἐν κυρ.] gives to the παρακαλῶ οὖν a touching force "ad excitandum affectum, quo sit efficacior exhortatio," "for the purpose of exciting emotion, whereby his exhortation might be the more efficacious," Estius; comp. Calvin. Similarly Ignat. *Trall.* 12: παρακαλεῖ ὑμᾶς τὰ δεσμά μου, ἃ ἕνεκεν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ περιφέρω, "my chains which I bear for the sake of Jesus Christ beseech you." But all that has been said about exciting *sympathetic* feeling,[1] *cheering* obedience,[2] and the like, is quite inappropriate, since it was just in his sufferings that Paul was conscious of all his dignity with holy pride (comp. iii. 13 and on Gal. vi. 17). So here, too, in the παρακαλῶ, the reader was to be affected by the consciousness of the dignity and greatness of the martyr who utters it.[3] According to *others*, Paul wishes to present himself as an *example*.[4] In that case he must at least have written: παρακαλῶ οὖν ἐγὼ ὁ δέσμ. ἐν κυρ. καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀξίως περιπ. κ.τ.λ. — ἐν κυρίῳ] does not belong to παρακαλῶ,[5] but to ὁ δέσμιος, beside which it stands, and which *alone* needs its significant reference; comp. iii. 1; Phil. i. 13. Paul was *the prisoner in the Lord* (the article as iii. 1), for he did not endure a captivity having its ground *apart from Christ*, —such as one suffers who for any other reason is placed in bonds,—but *in Christ* his being bound had its causal basis, just because he was bearing the chains for Christ's sake; without, however, ἐν κυρίῳ *signifying* "for Christ's sake" (comp. on Gal. i. 24), as Chrysostom, Theophylact, and many would have it. Comp. rather, συνεργὸς ἐν Χριστῷ, ἀγαπητὸς ἐν κυρίῳ, δόκιμος ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐκλεκτὸς ἐν κυρίῳ, Rom. xvi. 3, 8, 9, 10, 13, *al.* It gives to the δέσμιος its specific character, by which therefore the captivity was essentially distinguished from any other. — ἐν κυρίῳ] is annexed *without an article*, because it is blended with ὁ δέσμιος into a unity of conception. The *genitive* designation, iii. 1, expresses the same *thing*, but otherwise *conceived of*. — ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι κ.τ.λ.] *i.e.*, to lead such a life-walk as is appropriate to the call to the Messianic kingdom issued to you (at your conversion), 'ne sint tanta gratia indigni," "lest they be unworthy of such grace," Calvin. Comp. Phil. i. 27;

---

[1] Koppe and older expositors.

[2] "Ut Paulum obsequio exhilararent," "That they should delight Paul by their obedience," Bengel.

[3] Theodoret aptly remarks: τοῖς διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν δεσμοῖς ἐναβρύνεται μᾶλλον ἢ βασιλεὺς διαδήματι, "He delights in his bonds for Christ's sake more than a king does in his diadem."

[4] Harless, Olshausen; comp. also Koppe.

[5] Semler, Koppe with hesitation; Zanchius already suggested, but did not approve it.

Col. i. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. i. 11; Matt. iii. 8; Rom. xvi. 2; Bernhardy, p. 140. The future possession of the kingdom, forsooth, is destined only for those whose ethical frame is renewed and sanctified by the Holy Spirit. See vv. 21 ff., 30; Rom. viii. 4 ff., xiv. 17; Gal. v. 21 f.; 1 Cor. vi. 9 f., *al.* — ἧς] as at i. 6; and see on 2 Cor. i. 4. Attracted instead of ἥν. Yet Paul *might* have written ᾗ, 2 Tim. i. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 20.

Ver. 2. Μετὰ πάσ. ταπεινοφρ. κ. πραότ.] the characteristic dispositions accompanying this περιπατῆσαι; see Winer, p. 337, and with regard to πάσης, on i. 8; it belongs to *both* substantives. On the subject-matter, comp. Matt. xi. 29; Col. iii. 12. The opposite of *humility:* τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονεῖν, Rom. xii. 16, xi. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 17; δοκεῖν εἶναί τι, Gal. vi. 3. On the notion of πραότης, *gentleness*, see Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 140. [See Note XXXVI., p. 483 seq.] — μετὰ μακροθ.] is attached by Calvin, Estius, Zeltner, Calixtus, Baumgarten, Michaelis, Zachariae, Rückert, Holzhausen, Harless, Olshausen, to the following ἀνεχόμενοι. But the very repetition of the preposition, to which appeal is made, most naturally points backwards, so that μετὰ μακροθ. appears as parallel to μετὰ π. ταπεινοφρ. κ. πραότ., inasmuch, namely, as Paul makes the general be followed by the *special*, and then gives to the latter the elucidation ἀνεχόμενοι κ.τ.λ. Besides, μετὰ μακροθ., if it belonged to ἀνεχόμ., would have an undue emphasis, since without long-suffering the ἀνέχεσθαι ἀλλήλων would not exist at all; Col. iii. 12 f. Bengel and Matthies, following Theodoret and Oecumenius, have attached the whole μετὰ π. ταπ. κ. πραότ., μετὰ μακροθ. to ἀνεχόμενοι. But in this way we lose the gradual transition from the general ἀξίως περιπατ. τ. κλ. to the special ἀνεχόμ. ἀλλήλ., which under our construction is very naturally brought about. — ἀνεχόμ. ἀλλήλ. ἐν ἀγάπῃ] *The reciprocal forbearance in* (ethical habit) *love* (comp. Rom. xv. 1; Gal. vi. 2) is the practical expression of the μακροθυμία. Comp. Col. iii. 13. It consists in the fact that we "aliorum infirmitates aequo animo ferimus, nec ob ea, quae nobis in proximo displicent, ab ejus amicitia recedimus, sed *personam* constanter amamus, etsi *vitia* in odio habeamus," "bear the infirmities of others with patience, and do not withdraw from his friendship because of those things in our neighbor that displease, but constantly love his *person*, even though we have his *vices* in hatred," Calovius. The *nominative* of the participle (comp. Col. i. 10) is put κατὰ τὸ νοούμενον, because the *logical* subject of ἀξίως περιπατ., ver. 1, is ὑμεῖς.[1] Ignoring this familiar construction, Heinsius, Knatchbull, and Homberg have placed a full stop after ver. 1, and then supplied *estote*, "be ye," to the participles—a course which would only be admissible if, as in Rom. xii. 9, this concise, pregnant mode of expression were implied in the context. — ἐν ἀγάπῃ] belongs to the preceding. On the thing itself, comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 4. Lachmann, Holzhausen, and Olshausen attach it to σπουδάζοντες. The reason given by Olshausen, that, as the μακροθ. is only a form of expression of love, ἐν ἀγάπῃ could not belong to what precedes, would be set aside, even if it were in itself valid, by the correct separation of μετὰ μακροθ. from ἀνεχόμ. And ἀνεχόμ. ἀλλήλ., taken *alone*, renders the discourse simply abrupt. How harmonious is the structure, when both participial clauses begin with the participle and close with the definitions attached by ἐν, in which definitions there is opened up the whole ethical domain (*love* and *peace*) to which the before-named special virtues belong (1 Cor. xiii.) !

---

[1] See on iii. 18; comp. on 2 Cor. i. 7, and Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 970.

Ver. 3. Parallel of ἀνεχόμενοι κ.τ.λ., which is characterized as respects the effort by which it must be upheld. — τὴν ἑνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος] The πνεῦμα is not the *human* spirit, so that in general *animi studiorumque consensus*, "harmony of mind and desires" is meant,[1] but, as is shown from ver. 4, and is in itself clear from the exhortation to the *Christian* life (ver. 1), *the Holy Spirit*, instead of which we have not, with de Wette and Schenkel, to understand the Christian *spirit of the community ;* the N. T. knows not this modern notion, but knows only the *Holy* Spirit of *God*, as that which rules in the church (ii. 22), and upholds and develops its specific life, so that the latter has precisely in the κοινωνία τοῦ πνεύματος (Phil. ii. 1 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 13) its common source and support. Rightly already Chrysostom (τὸ πνεῦμα τοὺς γένει καὶ τρόποις διαφορόις διεστηκότας ἑνοῖ, "the Spirit unites those separated in race and in ways of difference") and his successors, Beza, Calovius, Bengel, and others, including Harless, Winzer, Bleek, and Ch. F. Fritzsche :[2] *the unity, which the Spirit produces.* Comp. Phil. i. 27 ; 1 Cor. xii. 13 ; John xvii. 21. And this unity is the *identity* of faith, of love, of sentiment, of hope, etc., in the different subjects who are moved by the Spirit. — ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης] is attached by Lachmann to what follows, whereby the parallelism with the preceding participial clause is destroyed. And after the definition by ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρ. being prefixed, several of the following elements of unity would not be appropriate, since even without the bond of peace there is one Lord, one baptism, one God and Father. — ἐν is ordinarily taken as *instrumental : through* the bond of peace. In opposition to the parallelism with ἐν ἀγάπῃ ; and through the unity of the Spirit the bond of peace is preserved, not the converse.[3] Hence : *in the bond of peace*, by which is denoted the *ethical relation, in which* they are to preserve the unity of the Spirit, namely, *while peace one towards another must be the bond, which is to envelope them.* τῆς εἰρήνης, accordingly, is genitive of *apposition.* Comp. σύνδεσμος εὐνοίας καὶ φιλίας, "a bond of good will and friendship," Plut. *Num.* 6 ; Acts viii. 23 ; Isa. lviii. 6. Others : "vinculum, *quo pax retinetur,*" "a bond whereby peace is maintained,"[4] and this is held to be *love.* Appeal is made to Col. iii. 14, and to the parallel with ἐν ἀγάπῃ. But, in Col. *l.c.*, love in fact is expressly *named*, and designated as σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος ; while justice is done to the parallel with ἐν ἀγάπῃ by our interpretation also, and it was at any rate most natural for the reader to understand under the the bond of peace peace *itself*, *conceived of as a bond*. Expositors would not have sought for another explanation, had they not taken ἐν as instrumental, in which case the difficulty obtruded itself, that the unity of the Spirit is not preserved by means of peace, but peace by means of the unity of the Spirit. That, moreover, no inference may be drawn from ver. 3 as to divisions prevailing in the church, Bengel has already rightly observed: "etiam ubi nulla fissura est, monitis opus est," "even where there is no sundrance, there is need of admonitions." And particularly was such exhortation natural for the apostle, even in the absence of special occasion, considering the many saddening experiences which he had met with elsewhere on this point!

---

[1] Ambrosiaster, Anselm, Erasmus, Calvin, Piscator, Estius, Wolf, Koppe, and many, including Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, and Rückert, according to whom Paul did not write τοῦ νοός, because he derives the unity of the spirit from the Divine Spirit.

[2] *Nova opp. acad.* p. 244.

[3] What de Wette observes in opposition to this view—that the peacefulness, to which the readers are exhorted, is to preserve the unity of the Spirit by the fact that it holds all enveloped with the bond of peace—is not sufficient ; since this peacefulness, which encircles all with the bond of peace, at any rate *presupposes* the unity of the Spirit. Where there is dispeace, this unity is already *wanting.*

[4] Bengel ; so Theophylact, Calovius, and others, including Rückert, Meier, Harless, Winzer.

Ver. 4, on to ver. 6. Objective relations of unity, to which the non-compliance with what is demanded in ver. 3 would be contradictory,[1] and which are consequently meant to incite towards compliance,—but without γάρ,[2] which gives greater animation to the discourse. The simple ἐστί is to be supplied (comp. 1 Cor. x. 17); for the discourse is not hortatory, as it is taken to be by Pelagius, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Calvin, Camerarius, Estius, Zachariae, Morus, Koppe, and others, including Hofmann,[3] with which vv. 5 and 6 would not be in accord; for the same reason also the words are not to be attached appositionally to σπουδάζοντες,[4] but they are independent and purely assertive: *there is one body and one Spirit.* On ἓν σῶμα, by which the totality of Christians as *corpus* (Christi) *mysticum*, "Christ's mystical body" is meant, comp. ii. 16; Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 13; on ἓν πνεῦμα, which is the *Holy Spirit*, the Spirit of that *corpus mysticum*, "mystical body," ii. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 13. The explanation: "*one body and one soul*" ("quasi diceret, nos penitus corpore et anima, non ex parte duntaxat, debere esse unitos," "as though he said that we ought to be completely united in body and soul, and not only partially," Calvin), is excluded, as at variance with the context, by the specifically Christian character of the other elements, and rendered impossible by the correct supplying of ἐστί (not *esse debetis*, "ye ought to be"). — καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθ. κ.τ.λ.] with which unity (ἓν σ. κ. ἓν πν.) the relation also of your calling is in keeping (comp. Col. iii. 15), which took place by the fact that (ἐν instrumental, see on Gal. i. 6) *one* hope (namely, that of the eternal Messianic bliss) was communicated to you; for all in fact were called by God to this very Messianic σωτηρία (Phil. iii. 14).—τῆς κλήσ. ὑμῶν] genitive, as at i. 18. Bengel, we may add, aptly remarks: "Spiritus est *arrhabo*, atque ideo cum ejus mentione conjungitur *spes haereditatis*," "The spirit is the *seal*, and therefore together with His mention, is joined the hope of inheritance."[5]

Ver. 5. Continuation. There are not several *Lords*, but *One*, who is Lord of all believers, even Christ ; not several kinds of *faith*, but *one* faith, inasmuch as all place their confidence upon the atoning death of Christ, on account of which they are justified and obtain salvation (Rom. iii. 23 ff.); not several kinds of *baptism*, but *one* baptism, namely, into Christ (Rom. vi. 3 ; Gal. iii. 27 ; Acts x. 48, xix. 5). — *εἷς κύριος* at the head ; because *μία πίστις* and the *ἓν βάπτισμα* accomplished in the case of those who have become believers are *consequentia*, "consequences," of *εἷς κύριος*. — To make of *πίστις* the doctrine of the faith,[1] is at variance with linguistic usage ; comp. on Gal. i. 23; Rom. i. 5. [See Note XXXVII., p. 484.] The *ἑνότης τῆς πίστεως* is here represented as *present*, but in ver. 13 as *future*. Both with justice ; inasmuch as here the Christian faith in the *narrower* sense is intended, the *fides salvifica*, "saving faith," which in *all* Christians was essentially the same, while at ver. 13 it is the Christian faith in the *wider* sense, within the compass of which there was diversity of convictions (as respects the validity of the law, the resurrection, veneration of angels, asceticism, partaking of flesh offered to idols, and other matters). — Of the *Lord's Supper*, the unity of which might likewise appear as a suitable element in the connection (1 Cor. x. 17), Paul does not make mention : according to Calovius, because it was comprehended "uno *baptismatis* sacramento *ex paritatis ratione*," "in the one sacrament of *baptism*, *because of equality*;" according to Harless, because Paul was mentioning only the fundamental conditions of the Christian fellowship, as they exist from the outset, at the first entrance upon it ; according to Olshausen, because the specific act of the Supper, the partaking (rather, the *communion*, 1 Cor. x. 16) of Christ, is included in *εἷς κύριος*, *μία πίστις* ; according to de Wette, because it was less a something conditioning the unity, than something representing this unity itself.[2] But, in opposition to Calovius and Olshausen, it may be urged that, if Paul had adopted the synecdochic point of view in the selection, he would not have needed to mention *πίστις*, since baptism presupposes faith ; in opposition to Harless, that the fundamental conditions of the Christian communion which Paul mentions are such, not specially for the beginning of it, but for its whole duration ; in opposition to de Wette, finally, that the Lord's Supper is, precisely as a *representation* of the unity, at the same time a powerful ethical *incitement* thereto, and hence would have been admirably appropriate in the series of points adduced. The ground of its not being mentioned is rather to be sought in the fact that the adducing of the Lord's Supper would have disturbed the threefold triad of the elements adduced, and have broken through the whole rhythm of the passage. And the holy meal *might* the more easily remain unmentioned, because it was at that time not yet an *observance subsisting by itself*, but was combined with the common meals ; hence, doubtless, in a context, *where the Lord's Supper is spoken of*, the *εἷς ἄρτος* (1 Cor. x. 17) is brought forward as a symbol of the unity of Christians, but in another context the thought *ἓν δεῖπνον κυρίου* or *μία τράπεζα* κυρίου—because the Supper was not something subsisting alone like baptism, which as the constituent element of Christian standing could *not* remain unmentioned—did not so necessarily suggest itself. [See Note XXXVIII., p. 484.]

---

[1] These set forth—(1) *the church itself constituted on the footing of unity*—one body, one Spirit, one blessed consummation, ver. 4; (2) *means, by which the constitution of it as an unity is produced and preserved*—one Lord, one faith, one baptism, ver. 5; (3) *the supreme ruler, disposer, and sustainer of this entire unity*—one God and Father, etc., ver. 6. Observe the *threefold tripartite* arrangement.

[2] Comp. Dissen, *ad Pind. Exc.* II. p. 277.

[3] *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 128.

[4] Bleek.

[5] Comp. also Clem. *Cor.* I. 46.

---

[1] Grotius, Zachariae, and others.

[2] Most mistakenly of all, Schenkel holds that Paul did not regard a *uniform* observance of the Supper as necessary, and would not stand in the way of the varied development of a *rite*. In that case, doubtless, Paul would have done well not to mention *baptism* either.

Ver. 6. Observe the *climactic* advance in vv. 4–6 : the *Church, Christ, God ;*—and at the same time the climax in the divine Triad : *Spirit, Lord, Father.* Only the dominion of the Father is the absolute one, that of the Son is the derived, conferred, obtained (Phil. ii. 9 ; 1 Cor. xv. 24 ff., iii. 23, *al.*,[1] in which He also disposes of the Spirit (2 Cor. iii. 18).[2] — πάντων] *i.e., of all believers,* as those who have the υἱοθεσία (i. 5 ; Rom. viii. 15 ; Gal. iii. 26, iv. 5), so that God is their *God and Father.* Holzhausen erroneously (seeing that the context treats of the *Christian* ἑνότης) thinks that all *men* are intended. Not even the *spiritually dead* members of the church are included,[3] as results from the sequel indicated by διά and ἐν, since they have not the Spirit and belong not to Christ (Rom. viii. 9), but are aloof from connection with Him and stand outside of grace (Gal. v. 4 f. ; John xv. 2, 6), consequently have no share in the body of Christ (i. 23) and in the living temple of God (ii. 22 f.). — ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων κ.τ.λ.] The relation of the Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων to the πᾶσι in threefold manner. Comp. Rom. xi. 36, where, however, the prepositions define the subject, not, as here, the object. πάντων, πάντων, and πᾶσιν are equally to be taken as *masculine*, because the preceding πάντων was masculine, and because the discourse continues in ver. 7 with ἑνὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ ἡμῶν, wherein the πάντες are individualized. Wrongly, therefore, many[4] have taken the first two as *neuter*, while the Vulgate, Zachariae, Koppe, *et al.*, give the second point alone as neuter, and Matthies, on the other hand, explains all three elements of the relation of God to the world and mankind, consequently as neuter. — ἐπὶ πάντων] ἐπάνω πάντων, "above all," Chrysostom ; τὴν δεσποτείαν σημαίνει, "He indicates absolute sway," Theodoret.[5] After this relation of *transcendence* there follows, in διὰ . . . πᾶσιν, that of *immanence.* — διὰ πάντων] cannot, since the πάντες are the *Christians* and the relation of God to what is *Christian* is characterized, apply either to the *creation*,[6] so that we should have to think of the all-penetrating creative power of God, or to *providence;*[7] but *the charismatic presence of God by means of the Holy Spirit, pervading and ruling all Christians,* is meant. See also ver. 7, and comp. 1 Cor. xii. 6. The distinction from the following ἐν πᾶσιν lies not in *the thing itself*, since both elements denote the immanent ruling of God by virtue of His Spirit, but in the *form of conception*, since with ἐν the relation is conceived of as operative *indwelling*, and with διά as operative *movement* throughout all Christian hearts.[8] According to Harless, the thought expressed in διὰ πάντων is, that God *as head works through the members.* But of the conception of the head and the members there is absolutely nothing in the context; further, though mention is made of God as *Father*, it is not the Father, but *Christ*, that is Head of the members; lastly, in place of the simple ὤν, which is to be mentally supplied, there would be insensibly introduced a wholly different supplement, namely, ἐνεργῶν, or a similar verb.[1] At the foundation of this explanation there lies, indeed, the presupposition, that the relation of the *Trinity* is expressed in the three prepositions, as Jerome, Thomas, and many of the older expositors would have it. Against this altogether arbitrary supposition, however, Theophylact already rightly declared himself.[2] Olshausen, too, finds here, as at Rom. xi. 36, the Trinity; holding that God is described in His various relations to the creature [rather to the *Christians*] as Lord *over* all things, as instrument *by* which they are (this being held to apply to the Son), and as the element *in* which they are. Thus, moreover, the prepositional relation of the last two clauses is exactly *reversed*, inasmuch as not διὰ πάντων κ.τ.λ. is explained, but δι' οὗ πάντες κ.τ.λ.! According to Beyschlag,[3] there is expressed, at least in the form of hint, the threefold *mode of existence of God* ("self-preservation, self-disclosure, self-communication"). But apart from the fact that such a threefold *form of existence* is not the expression of the New Testament triad, the self-communication, in fact, is implied not only in ἐν πᾶσιν, but necessarily already in διὰ πάντων. Lastly, Koppe is wrong in an opposite way: "Sententia videtur *una*, tantum variis *formulis* synonymis (!) expressa haec: *cui vos omnes debetis omnia*," "The thought seems *one;* only this is expressed in various synonymous formulas; viz., "*to whom you all owe all things.*"—Observe, further, that the great fundamental elements of unity, vv. 4–6, are *matters of fact*, historically *given* with Christianity itself, and as such are not affected by differences of *doctrine;* hence without reason there have been found here traces of the later age, when "upon the basis of the Pauline thought a Catholic church was built," of which the centralization in doctrine and constitution was not derived from the adherents of Paul, but was a Petrine thought.[4] The *Catholic* idea in our passage is just the Pauline one (1 Cor. xii.), cherished by Christ Himself (John xvii. 20 f.).

---

[1] Comp. Ernesti, *Ursprung d. Sünde*, I. p. 194 ff.

[2] See also Gess, *von der Person Christi*, 1st ed., p. 158 ff.

[3] In opposition to Münchmeyer.

[4] Including Erasmus, Michaelis, Morus, Rückert, Baumgarten-Crusius.

[5] Comp. Rom. ix. 5. See Wessel, *ad Diodor.* xiii. 14; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 474; Winer, p. 335.

[6] Estius, Wolf, and others.

[7] Chrysostom and his successors; Beza, Grotius: "per omnes diffundit providam suam gubernationem," "through all He diffuses his provident governance."

[8] "Deus enim Spiritu sanctificationis

Ver. 7.[5] Δέ] forms the transition from the summary πάντων, πάντων, πᾶσιν, ver. 6, to *each individual* among the Christians. No single one, however,—in order to adduce this also as motive to the preservation of the ἑνότης τοῦ πνεύματος,—was overlooked in the endowing with grace; *on every individ-*

---

diffusus est per omnia ecclesiae membra," "For by the Spirit of sanctification, God has been diffused through all the members of the Church," Calvin.

[1] This also in opposition to Winzer: "qui per omnes operatur, quasi unoquoque utitur ad declarandam suam majestatem, ad consilia sua exsequenda," "who works through all, as though He uses each one to declare His majesty and execute His counsels." So, in the main, de Wette (comp. Bengel): it applies to the *operation brought about by means of all;* and Reiche: "*omnibus utitur quasi instrumentis*, quibus . . . res Christiana stabilitur, augetur, consummatur," "*He uses all as instruments* whereby Christianity is established, augmented, and consummated."

[2] See also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 201.

[3] *Christol. d. N. T.* p. 250.

[4] Schwegler.

[5] See on vv. 7–9, Hoelemann, *Bibelstudien*, II. p. 93 ff.

ual was it conferred, the grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ, so that each individual on his part can and ought to contribute to the preservation of that unity. — ἡ χάρις] *i.e.*, according to the context, *the grace of God at work among the Christians*, the communication of which is manifested in the diverse χαρίσματα ; hence our passage is in harmony with the representation given, Rom. xii. 6. — ἐδόθη] by Christ. — κατὰ τὸ μέτρον κ.τ.λ.] τῆς δωρεᾶς is a subjective genitive (Rom. xii. 3, 6 ; Eph. iv. 13). Hence : in the proportion in which the gift of Christ is meted out, according as Christ apportions to the one a larger, to the other a smaller measure of His gift (*i.e.*, the gift of the divine χάρις). — The δωρεὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ is the gift *which Christ gives* (2 Cor. ix. 15), not : which Christ *has received*,[1] in opposition to which ver. 8, ἔδωκε δόματα τ. ἀνθρ., is decisive.

Ver. 8. If it had just been said that *by Christ* the endowment of grace was distributed in varied measure to each individual, this is now *confirmed by a testimony of the Scripture.* Nothing is to be treated as a parenthesis, inasmuch as neither course of thought nor construction is interrupted. — διὸ λέγει] *wherefore*, because the case stands, as has been said, ver. 7, *He saith. Who* says it (comp. v. 14), is obvious of itself, namely, *God*, whose word the Scripture is. See on 1 Cor. vi. 16 ; Gal. iii. 16 ; the supplying ἡ γραφή or τὸ πνεῦμα must have been suggested by the context (Rom. xv. 10). The manner of citation with the simple λέγει, obviously meant of God, has as its necessary presupposition, in the mind of the writer and readers, the Theopneustia of the O. T. The *citation* that follows is not "*ex carmine*, quod ab Ephesiis cantitari sciret," "from a hymn, which he knew was often sung by the Ephesians," and for which Ps. lxviii. 18 had partly furnished the words,[2]—which is quite an arbitrary way of avoiding the difficulty, and at variance with the divine λέγει,—but is the passage of Scripture Ps. lxviii. 18 itself according to the LXX. *with free alteration.* This psalm, in its historical sense a *song of triumph* upon the solemn entry of God into Zion,[3] is here understood according to its *Messianic* significance—an understanding, which has its warrant, not indeed in the much too general and vague proposition, that one and the same God is the Revealer of the Old and of the

---

[1] Oeder, in Wolf ; see in opposition to this view, already Calvin.

[2] Storr, *Opusc.* III. p. 309 ; Flatt.

[3] On what particular historic occasion this highly poetic song was composed, is for our passage a matter of indifference. According to the *traditional* view, it was composed by David on the occasion of the removal of the ark of the covenant from the house of Obed-edom to Jerusalem (2 Sam. vi. 12 ff. ; 1 Chron. xv. f.) ; according to Ewald, for the consecration of the new temple after the captivity ; according to Hupfeld, upon the return from the captivity and the restoration of the kingdom ; according to Hitzig, in celebration of the victory after the war of Jehoram and Jehoshaphat against the Moabites (2 Kings iii.). Others explain it otherwise. See the different views and explanations in Reuss, *d. acht u. sechzigste Psalm, ein Denkmal exeget. Noth u. Kunst*, 1851, who, however, himself very inappropriately (without "exegetical exigency and art") places the psalm in the late period between Alexander and the Maccabees, when the wish for the reunion of the scattered Israelites in Palestine is supposed to be expressed in it ; while Justus Olshausen even interprets it of the victories of the Maccabees under Jonathan or Simon. See Ewald, *Jahrb.* IV. p. 55 f. Certainly the psalm is neither Davidic nor of the Maccabaean age, but belongs to the restoration of the Theocracy after the captivity.

New Covenant,[1] but in the circumstance that the triumphal procession of Jehovah, celebrated in the psalm, represents the *victory of the Theocracy ;* and that, as every victory of the Theocracy is of a typical and in so far prophetic Messianic character, the return of Christ into heaven appears as the Messianic actual consummation of the divine triumph. The *free deviation* from the original text *and the LXX.* consists partly in the immaterial circumstance that Paul transfers into the third person that which is said in the second, and adds to ἀνθρώποις the article wanting in the LXX. ; partly in the essential point, that instead of the original sense : "Thou *receivedst* gifts (namely, gifts of homage) among[2] men,"[3] he expresses the sense : *He gave* gifts *to men,*[4] while in other respects reproducing the transition of the LXX. Consequently Paul has, as regards the ἔδωκε, given a sense *opposite* to the original one—a degree of variation such as, with all freedom in the employment of Old Testament passages, is nowhere else met with in the writings of the apostle, on which account the book *Chissuk Emuna* accused him of falsifying the words of the psalm, while Whiston looked upon the Hebrew text and the LXX. in Ps. lxviii. 18 as corrupt. This difference is not to be *explained,* with Rückert, by lightly asserting : "Paul did not even perhaps know exactly how the words ran," etc. ; for in this way he would be chargeable with a shallow caprice, for which there is no warrant; moreover, the agreement, in other respects, of the citation with the original text and the LXX. leads us to infer too exact an acquaintance with the passage adduced, to allow us to assume that Paul adduced the words in the full belief that נתן was read in the Hebrew, and ἔδωκε in the LXX. Rather must he have in reality *understood* the passage of the psalm, as to its main substance, just as he gives it. Inasmuch, namely, as he had recognized the words in their bearing upon the antitypical Messianic fulfilment, and that as a confirmation of what had been said of Christ in ver. 7, this latter special application must have been suggested to him by another *reading,* which he followed,[5] or else—with the freedom of a Messianic interpretation of the words—by an *exposition* of the Hebrew words, which yielded essentially the sense expressed by him. If the *latter* is the case (for in favor of the former there is no trace of critical support), he took לקחת, etc., in the sense : *thou didst take away gifts, to distribute them among men,*[6] and translated this *in an*

---

[1] Harless.

[2] Yet באדם might also denote that *men themselves* are the gifts. So Ewald takes it, *l.c.* (and comp. his *Ausführl. Lehrb. der Hebr. Sprache,* § 287 h), referring it specially to the humbler servants of the temple, whom David and Solomon, *e.g.,* gathered from among the subjugated peoples and settled around the temple, whom thus God, as if in a triumphal procession from Sinai to Zion, Himself brought in as captives, and then caused to be devoted by men to Him as offerings, in order that they, who were once so turbulent, might dwell peacefully in His service ("*even rebellious ones must dwell with Jah God,*" as Ewald renders the closing words of the passage). The sense : "*through* men," which Hoelemann, on account of ver. 11, finds as a "secondary" meaning in באדם, is not to be thought of, not even according to the apostle, who has expressed his view with such simple definiteness by ἔδωκε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

[3] לָקַחְתָּ מַתָּנוֹת בָּאָדָם, LXX. : ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ, or according to another reading : ἐν ἀνθρώποις.

[4] נָתַן מַתָּנוֹת לָאֲנָשִׁים.

[5] נתת instead of לקחת.

[6] On the בְּ, see Ewald, *Ausführl. Lehrb. der Heb. Spr.* § 217 f. 1.

explanatory way: *ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*; in connection with which the transposing into the third person is to be regarded as an unintentional variation in citing from memory. לקח, namely, has often the proleptic sense *to fetch* [Germ. *holen*], *i.e.*, to take anything for a person and to give it to him.[1] Comp. Bengel: "*accepit* dona, quae statim *daret*," "he *received* gifts, which he immediately *gave*." The utterance, however, as thus understood,[2] Paul has reproduced, *interpreting* it as he has done, in order to place beyond doubt the sense which he attached to it, for the reader who might have otherwise understood the words of the LXX. The Chaldee Paraphrast likewise understood לקח in such wise, that, while interpreting the passage of *Moses*, he could expound: לְהוֹן מַתְּנָן לִבְנֵי נָשָׁא, *dedisti dona filiis hominum*, "Thou hast given gifts to the children of men." It is evident from this, since there is good reason for presupposing in the Targum—the more so, as in our passage the Peshito agrees therewith[3]—older exegetical traditions, that Paul himself may have followed such a tradition.[4] To assume that he actually did so, is in itself, and in reference to the previous Rabbinical training of the apostle, free from objection, and has sufficient warrant in that old and peculiar agreement, even though we should explain the agreement between the same citation in Justin, *c. Tryph.* 39, 87, and the quotation of the apostle, by a dependence upon the latter.[5] On the other hand, it is not to be said, with Beza, Calovius, and most older expositors,[6] that the explanation given by Paul *really corresponds* with the historic sense of the passage in the Psalm,[7] which, judging by the context, is decidedly incorrect. Even Calvin says: "nonnihil a genuino sensu hoc testimonium detorsit Paulus," "Paul somewhat distorted this testimony from its genuine sense;" and already Theodore of Mopsuestia aptly remarks: *ὑπαλλάξας δὲ τὸ ἔλαβε δόματα οὕτως ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ κείμενον, ἔδωκε δόματα εἶπε, τῇ ὑπαλλαγῇ περὶ τὴν οἰκείαν χρησάμενος ἀκολουθίαν· ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ*, "exchanging the '*He received gifts*,' thus stated in the psalm, he said, '*He gave gifts*,' using hypallage for a proper construction; for there" (in the psalm) *πρὸς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τὸ ἔλαβεν ἥρμοττεν, ἐνταῦθα δὲ*, "he joined, '*received*,' to the subject, while here" (in our passage) *τῷ προκειμένῳ τὸ ἔδωκεν ἀκόλουθον ἦν*, "'*gave*' was in accordance with what preceded." The deviation from the historic sense cannot be set aside with fairness and without arbitrary presuppositions. This holds not only of the opinions of Jerome and Erasmus (that in the psalm לקח is used, because the *giving* has not yet taken place, but is promised as future) and of Calvin,[1] but also of the expedients to which Harless and Olshausen have recourse. According to Harless, namely, Paul wishes to express *the identity of God*, whose deeds at that time the word of Scripture represents in a *form* which, as identical with the *form* of Christ's action, makes us recognize the word of the O. T. as pointing forward to what was to come, and the Christ of the N. T. as the God who already revealed Himself under the O. T.; in the words of the psalm the captives themselves are described as *sacrificial gifts*, which the victor as God takes to Himself among men ; the apostle changes merely the *form* of the words, so far as the context makes it necessary, inasmuch as he wishes to make out that those vanquished ones—who have not made themselves what they are, but have been made so of God — are *those*, of whom he had said that on every one according to the measure of the gift of Christ the grace had been bestowed which was already pointed to in the psalm. "There is no other there," says the apostle, "than He who had descended to earth, to gain for Himself His own ; not that they would have presented themselves to Him, but He takes them as it pleases Him, and makes them what it pleases Him." But (1) Paul does not wish to express *the identity of God*, etc., but to show that what is said *of Christ* in ver. 7 was also already prophesied Ps. lxviii. 18 ; it was a question of the identity of the *thing*, as to which it was self-evident that the triumph celebrated in Ps. lxviii. is in the N. T. fulfilment celebrated by *Christ*, who had come in the name of the Lord. (2) In the Ps. *l.c.*, לקחת מתנות, "thou hast received gifts," applies to the *gifts of homage* which the triumphing Jehovah has received among (from) men. Certainly, according to another explanation (see above, Ewald's view, and comp. also Bleek), the men themselves, namely, the vanquished, may be regarded as the gifts or offerings which God has received; but who could withal read between the lines in the apostle's citation what, according to Harless, one ought to read between them, in order in the end to find only the *form* of the words changed ? Olshausen, who, we may mention, quite erroneously (see vv. 9, 10) specifies τοῖς ἀνθρώποις as the point of the citation,[2] agrees with Harless in so far as he is of opinion that the thought of the psalmist : "Thou hast taken to Thyself gifts among men," affirms nothing else than : "Thou hast chosen to Thyself the redeemed as offerings ;" but further adds : "But the man whom God chooses as an offering for Himself, *i.e.*, as an instrument for His aims, He furnishes with the gifts necessary to the attainment of the same ; and this side (?) the apostle, in accordance with his tendency, here brings into special prominence." Similarly also Hofmann,[1] who is of opinion that here, in the N. T. application of the passage from the psalm, it is one and the same thing whether one say : that Christ has, for the accomplishment of the work of His honor, caused to be given to Himself by His vanquished that which they possessed, or : that He has given them gifts to this end ; "for He takes that which is theirs into His service, when He gives to them what is His, to make them capable of service." Essentially so also Delitzsch on the psalm, *l.c.* Such subtleties, by means of which any *quid pro quo* at pleasure may easily enough be got out of the alleged light and significance of the "history of the fulfilment,"[2] may be conveniently foisted upon the words of the apostle, but with what right ?—*ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος*] Whether we understand the עָלִיתָ לַמָּרוֹם in the original text of the ascending of the victorious God into *heaven*[3] or to Zion,[4] or leave it without more precise definition of place ;[5] according to the Messianic accomplishment of the divine triumphal procession, which takes place through Christ, the words apply to *Christ ascended* (comp. *ὑψωθείς*, Acts ii. 33) *to heaven* (Ps. cii. 20, *al.;* Ecclus. xiii. 8 ; Luke i. 78), who *has brought in as captives* enemies that have been vanquished by Him upon this triumphal march. [See Note XXXIX., p. 484 seq.]—*αἰχμαλωσία*, namely, is the abstract collective for *αἰχμάλωτοι* (Judith ii. 9 ; Ezr. vi. 5 ; Rev. xiii. 10 ; Diod. Sic. xvii. 70), like *ξυμμαχία* for *ξύμμαχοι*, etc. See on ii. 2. On the connection with the kindred verb (to take captive, to lead, to bring in as such), comp. 2 Chron. xxviii. 5 ; 1 Macc. ix. 72 ; and see, in general, Winer, p. 201 ; Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 501. The character of *αἰχμαλωτεύω* as Greek is even worse than that of *αἰχμαλωτίζω*.[6] But *what subjects* are meant by *αἰχμαλωσία* ? Not the *redeemed*, as already Justin, *c. Tryph.* 36 ; further, Theodoret (*οὐ γὰρ ἐλευθέρους ὄντας ἡμᾶς ᾐχμαλώτευσεν, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου γεγενημένους ἀντηχμαλώτευσε, καὶ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῖν ἐδωρήσατο*, "He did not make captive us who were free, but in turn made us captive who were under the devil, and presented us with freedom") Oecumenius, Thomas, Erasmus,[7] and others, including Meier, Harless, Ols-

---

[1] See Gen. xviii. 5, xxvii. 13, xlii. 16, xlviii. 9; Job xxxviii. 20 (and Hirzel *in loc.*); 2 Sam. iv. 6, *al.*; see Gesen. *Thes.* II. p. 760, and Hoelemann, p. 97 f.

[2] The phrase formerly so often compared, לָקַח אִשָּׁה לִבְנוֹ (Ex. xxi. 10, xxxiv. 16), is not in place here, since לָקַח, in that phrase, signifies nothing else than the simple *take.*

[3] Which likewise, Ps. lxviii. *l.c.*, has *dedisti dona filiis hominum*, "Thou hast given gifts to the children of men."

[4] Holzhausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Credner, *Beiträge*, II. p. 121 f.

[5] Credner, *Beitr.* II. p. 120.

[6] Chrysostom, without, however, entering into any particulars, says merely: the prophet says *thou hast received*, but Paul: *he has given*; and the two are one and the same. Theodoret more precisely explains himself: *ἀμφότερα δὲ* (the taking and giving) *γεγένηναι· λαμβάνων γαρ τὴν πίστιν ἀποδίδωσι τὴν χάριν*, "both occurred; for receiving faith, he gave grace." Comp. Oecumenius.

[7] See especially, Geier, *ad Ps. l.c.* p. 1181; comp. also Hoelemann, p. 98 f.

---

[1] "Quum de Christi exaltatione pauca verba Psalmi citasset, *de suo adjecit*, cum dedisse dona, ut sit minoris et majoris comparatio, qua ostendere vult Paulus, quanto praestantior sit ista Dei ascensio in Christi persona, quam fuerit in veteribus ecclesiae triumphis," "When he cited a few words of the Psalm concerning Christ's exaltation, *he added by his own authority*, that he had given gifts, in order that there might be a comparison of less and greater, whereby Paul wants to show how much more excellent is this ascension of God in the person of Christ, than it was in the ancient triumphs."

[2] "Paul does not wish by the quotation primarily to represent Christ as the dispenser of the gifts, but to prove from the O. T. itself *the universality of the gifts of Christ*, consequently the equal title of the Gentiles; He has by His redemption conferred gifts not merely on this one or that one, not upon the Jews alone, but *upon men as such*, *upon mankind*." What Olshausen has further advanced respecting the dative expression with the article (instead of which the Hebrew text has *among men*, while no article is used in the LXX.)—to wit, that by ἔδ. δόμ. τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, which applies to *all* men, it is not intended to say: all men *must* be redeemed, and as redeemed receive gifts ; but: all men *may* be redeemed, and as redeemed obtain gifts of grace; and in so far this deviation from the original was altogether immaterial—is pure invention. The difference certainly

---

does not lie in the fact that בָּאָדָם points only to *some*, and the expression of Paul to *all* men, as Olshausen supposes, but solely in the לָקַחַת of the original text and the ἔδωκε of Paul. As well בָּאָדָם as τοῖς ἀνθρώποις designates men according to the *category ;* but according to the original text it is men who are the *givers*, so that the Triumphator *takes* them ; whereas, according to Paul, the men are the *recipients*, to whom He *gives*.

[1] *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 484 f.

[2] Delitzsch.

[3] Hengstenberg, Lengerke, Hitzig, Harless, Hoelemann, and others.

[4] Ewald, Bleek.

[5] Hofmann.

[6] See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 442.

[7] "Captivorum gregem e peccati diabolique tyrannide liberatum," "a body of captives delivered from the tyranny of sin and the devil."

hausen,[1] Baumgarten-Crusius,[2] have interpreted it ; seeing that the captives, both according to the original text and according to our citation, are *different* from the ἀνθρώποι, "men," who are subsequently mentioned, namely, *such* vanquished ones as are visited by the victor with the hard penal fate of captives in war. Hence also it cannot be *the souls delivered by Christ from Hades*[3] that are spoken of. It is the *enemies of Christ* and His kingdom, the *antichristian powers*, including those of hell (but not these alone) ; their power is broken by the completed redeeming work of the Lord. By His resurrection and exaltation they have been rendered powerless, and subjected to His victorious might ; consequently they appear, in accordance with the poetical mould of our passage, as those whom He has vanquished and carries with Him on His procession from Hades into heaven (see ver. 9), so that He, *having gone up on high*, *brings them in as prisoners of war.* Not as if He has *really* brought them in captivity to heaven, but under the *figure of the triumphator*, as which the ascended Christ appears in accordance with the prophetic view given in Ps. lxviii., the matter thus presents itself, namely, the overcoming of His foes displaying itself through His ascension. This vanquishing, we may add, in its actual execution still continues even after the entering upon the kingly office which took place with the exaltation of Christ ; δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ἄχρις οὗ θῇ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, "for He must reign, till He hath put all enemies under His feet," 1 Cor. xv. 25. Not the *final* overcoming of the foes of Christ is thus meant, but the *actual* αἰχμαλωτεύειν αἰχμαλ. ofttimes recurs until the final consummation, until at length ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος, "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death," 1 Cor. xv. 26, namely, at the resurrection on the last day. In this case, however, there is the more reason for leaving the matter without more precise definition of the hostile powers vanquished (Satanic and human), as the context suggests nothing more special, and as, speaking generally, the ἠχμαλώτ. αἰχμαλ. does not form for the aim and connection of *our passage* the essential point of the psalmist's saying, but the latter would have been quite as fully in its place here, even though that ἠχμαλώτ. αἰχμ. had not been inserted, since the element confirmatory of ver. 7 lies simply in the ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.[4] Yet we have not, with

---

[1] "Men upon earth, so far as they are held captive by sin and in the ultimate ground by the prince of this world, and among these, in particular, the Gentile world."

[2] "Those gained for the kingdom of Christ."

[3] Lyra, Estius, and many Catholic expositors ; König, *von Christi Höllenfahrt*, p. 26 ; Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 414 ; and Baur.

[4] Chrysostom, Theophylact, Beza, Calovius, and many others understood specially the devil and those things connected with him, death, condemnation, and sin. Comp. Luther's gloss : "that is sin, death, and conscience, that they may not seize or keep us." Grotius rationalizes : "*per apostolorum doctrinam*, vicit et velut captivam egit *idololatriam et vitia alia*," "*by the doctrine of the apostles* he conquered and led *idolatry and other vices* captive." Most comprehensively, but with an admixture of heterogeneous elements, Calvin says : "Neque enim Satanam modo et peccatum et mortem totosque inferos prostravit, sed ex rebellibus quotidie facit sibi obsequentem populum, quum verbo suo carnis nostrae lasciviam domat ; rursus hostes suos, *i.e.*, impios omnes quasi ferreis catenis continet constrictos, dum illorum furorem cohibet

Morus,[1] to rationalize the conception of the apostle : "removit omnia, quae religionis suae propagationi et felicitati hominum obstarent impedimenta," "He removed all things which, as impediments, obstructed the propagation of his religion and the happiness of men," by which the sense is altered, and vanquished foes become obstacles taken out of the way. — *δόματα*] according to Paul, gifts in which *ἐδόθη ἡ χάρισ*, ver. 7, thus equivalent to *χαρίσματα*. An appropriate commentary on the sense in which Paul has taken the citation, is Acts ii. 33. But to look upon the interpretation of the *ἔλαβε δόματα* of the Ps. *l.c.*, in the sense of gifts of the Spirit as current among the *disciples of the apostles*,[2] is the more arbitrary, inasmuch as de Wette himself finds it probable that some *apostle* [see Note XL., p. 485,] has allegorized the passage of the psalm.

Ver. 9 is not a (Rabbinical) argument to show that the subject of the passage in the psalm is no other than Christ, in so far as of Him alone could be predicated that descending which, in speaking of ascending, must be presumed to have gone before.[3] Such an argument would have been aimless, since the subject of the passage of the psalm in its Messianic fulfilment was self-evident ; it would, moreover, not have even logical correctness, since, in fact, God Himself, as often in the O. T., might be thought of as the *καταβάς* who *ἀνέβη*. Paul rather brings out in ver. 9 *what the ascension of Christ prophetically meant in* Ps. lxviii. *contains as its presupposition ;* and this for the end of showing[4] how the matter affirmed and supported by the passage of the psalm in ver. 7, namely, Christ's bestowal of grace on all individuals respectively, *stands in necessary connection with His general position of filling the whole universe ; a function upon which He must have entered by His very descending into the depths of the earth and His ascending above all heavens* (ver. 10). — *δέ*] carrying forward the argument : "but the *ἀνέβη*, in order now to show you what is *therewith* said," etc. — *τὸ ἀνέβη*] not : the *word ἀνέβη*, for this does not occur in the passage of the psalm, but the *predicate ἀνέβη*, which was *contained* in *ἀναβάς*. — *τί ἐστιν*] not : what *of an extraordinary nature*,[5] but simply : *what is said therewith, what is implied in it?* Comp. Matt. ix. 13 ; John xvi., 17 f., x. 6, *al.* — *ὅτι καὶ κατέβη*] *that He also* (not merely ascended, but also) *descended.* The having ascended presupposes the having descended. The correctness of this conclusion rests upon the admitted fact that the risen Christ had His original dwelling not upon earth, as Elijah had, but in the heaven, whither He went up ; consequently

---

sua virtute, ne plus valeant, quam illis concedit, "For not only did he prostrate Satan, and sin, and death, and all hell, but out of the rebellious he daily makes for Himself an obedient people, when by His word he subdues the wantonness of our flesh ; again His enemies, *i.e.*, all the godless He holds bound as though with iron chains, while by his virtue He curbs their fury, so that they have no more power than He concedes them."

[1] Comp. Flatt.

[2] De Wette.

[3] Michaelis, Koppe ; Güder, *von der Erschein. Christi unter den Todten*, p. 83 ; also *my own* earlier view.

[4] The view of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Cornelius à Lapide, and others, again taken up by Olshausen (comp. also Hofmann, *l.c.* 343), that Paul would by the example of Christ exhort to *humility*, is quite at variance with the context. And Rückert also is wrong in holding that ver. 9 contains only an incidental remark, which might equally well have been wanting.

[5] Hoelemann.

He could not but have descended from this, if He has ascended. Comp. John iii. 13. —The *depth*, however, into which He descended—whether, namely, merely to the earth, or deeper still into the subterranean world—is not to be inferred from the ἀνέβη itself, but was fixed with historic certainty in the believing consciousness of the readers ; hence Paul could with good reason write not merely ὅτι καὶ κατέβη, but ὅτι καὶ κατ. εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς, i.e., *into that which is deeper down than the earth*, into *Hades.*[1] He might also have designated Hades by τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς, *the lowest depth of the earth* (תַּחְתִּיּוֹת הָאָרֶץ, LXX. Ps. lxiii. 9 ; Prayer of Azar. 13 ; *not* Ps. cxxxix. 15, where "in the depths of the earth" is only a sensuous form of the conception "in secret") ; but has *purposely chosen* that *comparative* expression—in which the genitive is that of comparison, not the partitive genitive—in order to impart as strong a coloring as possible to the depth of Hades, in contradiction to that heaven from which Christ descended ; He descended *deeper than the earth is* (the earth being conceived of as a plane), in that He descended even into the *sub*terranean region beyond, into Hades. The goal of the humiliation Paul here designates *locally*, whereas at Phil. ii. 8 he specifies it as respects the *degree*, namely, by μέχρι θανάτου κ.τ.λ., which, however, is as to substance in agreement with our passage, since the death of Christ had as its immediate consequence His descent into Hades (Luke xxiii. 43 ; Matt. xii. 40 ; Acts ii.27 ; 1 Pet. iii. 19), as, indeed, also at Phil. ii. 10 (καταχθονίων) this descent is presupposed as having taken place in death. The explanation of the so-called *descent into hell*[2] is therefore the right one,[3] because the object was to present Christ as the One who fills the whole universe, so that, with a view to His entering upon this His all-filling activity, He has previously with His victorious presence passed through the whole world, having descended from heaven into the *utmost depth*, and ascended from this depth to the *utmost height*—a view, which of necessity had to extend not merely to the earth, but even into the *nether world*, just because Christ, as was historically certain for every believer, *had been* in the nether world, and consequently, by virtue of His exaltation to the right hand of God, really had the two *utmost* limits of the universe, from below upwards, as the *terminos a quo* and *ad quem* of His triumphal progress. Further, had Paul intended only the descent *to earth*,[4] it would not be easy to see why he should not have written merely κατέβη, or at any rate simply κατέβη εἰς τὴν γῆν or κατέβη εἰς τὴν γῆν κάτω (Acts ii. 19), instead of employing the circumstantial and affected, but yet only feebly paraphrasing expression : *into the lower regions, which are the earth* (for so we should have to explain εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς, understood only of the earth ; see Winer, *l.c.*). This expression is only accounted for, sharp and telling, when it points the reader to a region *lower than the earth*, to that *Hades*, whither every reader knew that Christ had descended. Doubtless the apostle might have written simply εἰσ ᾅδου (Acts ii. 27) or ἕως ᾅδου (Matt. xi. 23), or also εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον (Rom. x. 7) or εἰς τὴν καρδίαν τῆς γῆς (Matt. xii. 40) ; but the whole pathos of the passage, with its contrast of the extremes of depth and height, very naturally suggested the purposely chosen designation εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς. The ordinary objection, that, in fact, Christ did not ascend from Hades, but from earth to heaven, is of no effect, because He has in reality returned, arisen and ascended from Hades, consequently Hades was the deepest *terminus a quo* of His ascension, as it had previously been the deepest *terminus ad quem* of His descent, and on this deepest turning-point all here depended, even apart from the fact that the long interval of forty days between resurrection and ascension is historically very problematic (see Remark subjoined to Luke xxiv. 51). Nearest to our view come Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Bullinger, Drusius, Zachariae, and others, who, however, refer the passage only to the *death* and the *burial ;*[1] whereas Calomesius, Witsius, Calixtus, and others (already Beza, by way of suggestion), appealing to Ps. cxxxix. 15, strangely enough interpret it of the descent into the *womb*. [See Note XLI., p. 485.]

---

[1] κατέβην δόμον Ἄϊδος εἴσω, "I descended within the abode of Hades," Hom. *Od.* xxiii. 252 ; Ἀΐδαο δόμους ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης ἔρχεαι, "You come to the abode of Hades, beneath the depths of the earth," *Il.* xxii. 482 ; comp. *Od.* xxiv. 204; Soph. *Ant.* 816, *Trach.* 1088.

[2] Irenaeus in Pitra, *Spicileg. Solesmense*, I. p. 7 ; Tertullian, Jerome, Pelagius, Ambrosiaster, Erasmus, Estius, Calovius, Bengel, and many others, including Rückert, Olshausen, Delitzsch, Lechler, Ewald, Hoelemann, Bleek ; Baur scenting Gnosticism [Braune, Gess, Ewald, H. Müller].

[3] Thomasius, II. p. 262, is still doubtful on the question ; Kahnis, I. p. 508, regards it as preponderantly probable. Calvin called it *inepta*, "silly," and Reiche *falsa*, "false."

[4] Thomas, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Hammond, Michaelis, Fischer, *de vitiis Lex. N. T.*, and many, including Winer, p. 470 ; Holzhausen, Meier, Matthies, Harless, Räbiger, p. 68 ff., Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hofmann, p. 345, Bisping, Schenkel, Schmid, *Bibl. Theol.* II. p. 291, Reiche, *Comm. crit.* p. 1174 f., Beyschlag, *Christol. d. N. T.* 228 [Weiss' *Bibl. Theol.*, R. Schmidt, Hilgenfeld, Pfleiderer, Reuss, Engelhardt].

Ver. 10. Result from ver. 9, without οὖν, but thereby coming in the more vividly and with a certain triumph ; "alio gravi dicto antecedentia complectitur aut absolvit," "By another weighty expression he sums up or completes what precedes."[2] — The prefixed ὁ καταβάς has the emphasis, which is further augmented by αὐτός :[3] *The one who descended, just He,* He precisely (identity of the person), *is also the one who ascended on high above all heavens.* — ὁ ἀναβὰς ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐραν.] points back to that ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος, ver. 8, more precisely defining this εἰς ὕψος as the region *highest of all.* The expression "*above all heavens*" has its basis in the conception of *seven* heavens, which number is not to be diminished to *three.*[4] See on 2 Cor. xii. 2. The ὑπεράνω (in the N. T. only here and i. 21 ; Heb. ix. 5) describes the exaltation of Christ—clearly to be maintained as local—as the highest of all (comp. ὑπερύψωσε, Phil. ii. 9), in such wise that He, having ascended through all heavens (διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς, Heb. iv. 14), has seated Himself above in the highest heaven, as the σύνθρονος of the Father, at the right hand of God. Comp. Heb. vii. 26 : ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος. The spiritualistic impoverishing of this concrete conception to a mere denial of all "enclosure within the world"[5] is nothing but a rationalistic invention. Comp.

---

[1] Comp. also *Erlang. Zeitschr.* 1856, p. 284.

[2] Dissen, *ad Pind. Exc.* II. p. 278.

[3] οὐ γὰρ ἄλλος κατελήλυθε καὶ ἄλλος ἀνελήλυθεν, "For he who came down is no other than he who went up," Theodoret.

[4] Harless : ἀήρ, αἰθήρ, τρίτος οὐρανός ; comp. Grotius, Meier [Delitzsch in *Luth. Zeitschrift* for 1873, pp. 609–13], and others.

[5] Hofmann, II. 1, p. 535.

Acts vii. 56, iii. 21, i. 9–11. — ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα] points back to the bestowal of grace expressed in ver. 7, and prophetically confirmed in ver. 8, and that as expressing the *universal relation* into which Christ has entered *towards the whole world* by His exaltation from the lowest depth to the loftiest height ; in which universal relation is also of necessity contained, as a special point, that bestowal of grace on all individuals. As *intended aim*, however (ἵνα), this πληροῦν τὰ πάντα stands related to the previous ascension of Christ from the uttermost depth, into which He had descended, to the uttermost height of heaven ; because He had first, like a triumphing conqueror (see ver. 8), to take possession of His *whole* domain, i.e., *the whole world from Hades to the highest heaven*, in order now to wield His kingly sway over this domain, by virtue of which *He was to fill the universe with His activity of sustaining and governing, and especially of providing all bestowal of grace.* [See Note XLII., p. 485.] This was to be the all-embracing task of His kingly office, until the consummation indicated at 1 Cor. xv. 28. It is according to this view, and from i. 23, self-evident that we have to explain πληρ. τὰ πάντα, neither with Koppe,[1] *de vaticiniorum complemento*, "of the fulfilment of prophecies," nor with Rückert and Matthies, of the *completion of the redeeming work;* nor yet possibly to limit τὰ πάντα to the whole *Christian community.*[2] Comp. rather on i. 23, and observe that in our passage that ἑνὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη κ.τ.λ. of ver. 7 stands to this ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα in the same relation of the species to the genus, as in i. 23 τὸ πλήρωμα (Χριστοῦ) does to τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμένου. The *ubiquity of the body of Christ*[3] is not here, any more than at i. 23 or elsewhere, spoken of ;[4] although, with Philippi, Hoelemann has still found it here, holding the conception of the purely dynamic πληροῦν τὰ πάντα as unrealizable, because Christ is in a glorified body. If this reason were valid, an *absolute* bodily omnipresence would result : it proves *too much*, and leads to a *contradictio in adjecto*, which could only receive a Docetic solution. [See Note XIV. on chap. i. 20 ; and Note III. on chap. i. 3.]

Ver. 11.[5] *And he has*, etc. From the general πληροῦν τὰ πάντα, ver. 10, there is now brought into prominence in reference to the *church*, with a retrospective glance at ver. 7, the *special* point with which the apostle was here concerned, in order to give the clinching argument to his exhortation as to the keeping of the unity of the Spirit. Christ, who has ascended from the lowest depth to the loftiest height, in order to fill all things, *precisely He*, has—such is His *autonomy* in His church—given the different teachers and leaders of the church, until we all shall have attained to the unity of the faith, etc. — We are not to treat as a parenthesis either vv. 8–10[1] or vv. 9, 10,[2] since the continuation of the discourse with *καὶ αὐτός* emphatically attaches itself to the preceding *αὐτός*. — *ἔδωκε*] is not, any more than at i. 22, equivalent to *ἔθετο*,[3] seeing that, in fact, the *giving* in the proper sense, to which Paul here looks back, has preceded, and Christ has in reality *given* the apostles, etc., to the church,[4] namely, through the specific charismatic *endowment* and, respectively also, by His own immediate *calling* (*ἀποστόλους*) of the *persons* in question. Calvin rightly remarks on *ἔδωκε*: "quia nisi excitet, nulli erunt," "for unless He call forth there will be none." This raising up and granting of the appropriate *persons* for the perfecting of the church as His body, not the institution of a spiritual office in itself, which as such has exclusively to administer His means of grace, is here ascribed to Christ.[5] The appointing to the service of the individual congregations (as *ποιμένας καὶ διδασκ.*) of such persons given by Christ lay in the choice of the congregations themselves, which choice, conducted by apostles or apostolic men, Acts xiv. 23, took place under the influence of the Holy Spirit, Acts xx. 28. Thus Christ gave the *persons*, and the community gave to them the *service*. As regards the time of the *ἔδωκε*, it is to be observed that this was indeed *a potiori* the time after the ascension (among the apostles in the narrower sense, also as respects Matthias and Paul), but that, as was obvious for the readers, the earlier appointment of the original apostles was not thereby excluded. The latter, namely, are not *alone* meant by *ἀποστόλους*, but (comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 7) also men like Barnabas and James the Lord's brother must be reckoned among them. — The *order* in which they are brought up is such, that those not assigned to a single church precede (*ἀποστ.*, *προφ.*, *εὐαγγ.*), and these are arranged in the order of rank. Hence the *ποιμένες*, because belonging to particular churches, had to follow, and it is without reason that a Montanistic depreciation of the bishops[6] is found here. — *τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους*] *some as apostles.* Their characteristics are their immediate calling by Christ, and their destination for all nations. Comp. on 1 Cor. xii. 28. — *προφήτας*] As to these speakers, who, on the receipt of revelation and through the Holy Spirit, wrought with highly beneficial effect, yet without ecstasy, who likewise in iii. 5 are mentioned after the apostles, see on 1 Cor. xii. 10; Acts xi. 27. — *εὐαγγελιστάς*] who *περιϊόντες ἐκήρυττον*, "going about, preached," Theodoret;[7] missionary assistants to the apostles. See on Acts xxi. 8. Oecumenius would, at variance with the context (for Paul is speaking only of the exercise of *teaching* in the church), and probably also at variance with history (at least as regards our canonical gospels), understand the *authors of the Gospels*, which is adduced as possible also by Chrysostom. — *τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκ.*] denotes not the presbyters and *deacons*,[1] nor the presbyters and *exorcists*,[2] nor yet the presbyters and teachers as two *separate* offices,[3] the latter in the sense of 1 Cor. xii. 28 ; but, as the non-repetition of *τοὺς δέ* shows, the presbyters and teachers *as the same persons*, so that the presbyters are designated by *ποιμένας* in stated figurative appellation (1 Pet. v. 2 ; Acts xx. 28 ; John xxi. 15 ff.) with reference to their function of guiding *oversight* over doctrine, life, and order in the church, consequently as *ἐπίσκοποι* ;[4] and by *διδασκάλους*, with reference to their *function of teaching*. We may add, that the *διδάσκαλοι* were not, as such, at the same time presbyters, for the *διδαχή* was imparted by a special *χάρισμα*, which even ordinary members of the church might possess (1 Cor. xiv. 26) ; but every presbyter was at the same time *διδάσκαλος*, and had to be endowed with this *χάρισμα* ; hence Paul here *puts together* *ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους*, and, 1 Tim. iii. 2, it is laid down as the requirement of an *ἐπίσκοπος* that he should be *διδακτικός*. — Comp. Tit. i. 9. See also Augustine, *Ep.* lix. Comp. Jerome : "Nemo . . . pastoris sibi nomen assumere debet, nisi possit docere quos pascit," "No one ought to assume for himself the name of pastor, unless he can teach whom he feeds." 1 Tim. v. 17 is not opposed to this (see Huther *in loc.*).

---

[1] Following Anselm and others.

[2] Beza, Grotius, Morus, Flatt, Schenkel, and others.

[3] Faber Stapulensis, Hunnius, and others ; specially contended for by Calovius.

[4] Wrongly are Oecumenius and Theophylact adduced as favoring this explanation. They, forsooth, very correctly refer the filling to the dominion and operation of Christ (comp. also Chrysostom), and observe with equal justice that Christ, after He had already before His incarnation filled all things by His purely divine nature, now, after having, as the Incarnate One, descended and ascended, does the filling of the universe μετὰ σαρκός, "with his flesh" (Oecumenius), *i.e.*, so that in doing so He is in a different state than before, namely, *clothed with a body*, consequently as *God-man.*

[5] See Schott, *Progr. quo locus Pauli Ephes.* iv. 11 *seq.*, *breviter explic.*, Jen. 1830.

---

[1] Griesbach and others.

[2] Koppe.

[3] Theophylact and many, including Meier, Harless, Baumgarten-Crusius.

[4] Observe the importance, for the continued appointment of the ministers in the church, of the conception of the matter implied in *ἔδωκε*. Christ *gives* the ministers of the church; the church *takes* those given, and places them in the service of the church. Thus the church (or whoever has to represent the rights and duties of the church) has not in any way arbitrarily to choose the subjects, but to discern those endowed by Christ as those thereby given to it by Him, to acknowledge and to induct them into the ministry; hence the highest idea of the ecclesiastical scrutiny is, to test whether the persons in question have been *given by Christ*, without prejudice, we may add, to the other existing requirements of ecclesiastical law.

[5] Comp. (in opposition to Münchmeyer) Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 283 ff.; Müller in the *Deutsche Zeitschr.* 1852, No. 21.

[6] Baur.

[7] See Nösselt, *ad Theodoret.* p. 424.

Ver. 12. Behoof, for which Christ has given, etc. "Non potuit honorificentius verbi ministerium commendare, quam dum hunc illi effectum tribuit," "He could not commend the ministry of the word with greater honor, than by ascribing to it this effect," Calvin. — The three clauses are not *co-ordinate*.[5] Against the co-ordination may be decisively urged not the varying of the prepositions, for Paul is fond of interchanging them (comp. Rom. iii. 30, v. 10, xv. 2 ; 2 Cor. iii. 11), but the circumstance that *εἰς ἔργον διακονίας* in its position between the first and third points would be unsuitable.[6] Rather are *εἰς ἔργ. διακον.* and *εἰς οἰκοδ. τοῦ σώμ. τοῦ Χρ.* two definitions to *ἔδωκε*, *not* parallel to *πρὸς τὸν καταρτ. τῶν ἁγίων*, but parallel to *each other;* so that we have thus, with Lachmann, Harless, Tischendorf, Bleek, to delete the comma after *ἁγίων*. *πρὸς τὸν καταρτ. τῶν ἁγίων* contains, namely, the aim for which Christ has given those designated in ver. 11 *εἰς ἔργον διακονίας, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χρ.* *He has, on behalf of the full furnishing of the saints, given those teachers for the work of the ministry, for the edification of the body of Christ.* The objection that the *οἰκοδ. τοῦ σώμ.* is a yet higher aim than that of the *καταρτ. τῶν ἁγίων*[7] is incorrect ; since, on the contrary, the καταρτ. τ. ἁγ. is the higher point, which is to be attained by the edification of the body of Christ, and consequently might be conceived of as aimed at therein.[1] Observe, withal, the expression of *perfection :* καταρτ., and the expression of *development :* οἰκοδομή. Many others, including de Wette, have made the two clauses with εἰς dependent on καταρτισμόν, so that the sense would be : "for the qualifying of believers that they may in each and every way themselves labor for the advancement and edification of the church."[2] But (*a*) διακονία, where the context is speaking of those engaged in the service of the church, always denotes the *official* service (Rom. xi. 13 ; 2 Cor. iv. 1, vi. 3 ; comp. Acts vi. 4 ; 2 Cor. iii. 7 ff., ix. 12, *al.*), and hence may not here be transmuted into the general notion of *rendering service to, furthering* (see especially 1 Pet. iv. 10). And if we should in that connection retain the official notion of διακονία,[3] *the training of the* ἅγιοι *to be teachers* would be the thought resulting ; which would be inappropriate, because Paul regarded the *Parousia* as so near, and conceived of the χαρίσματα as continuing till then (see 1 Cor. xiii. 8), and therefore the thought that teachers had to be trained was remote from his mind. (*b*) But if he had merely meant to say : "to make the individual Christians jointly and severally meet for co-operating to the furtherance of the church,"[4] then πάντων would have been to τῶν ἁγίων an *essential* element, which could not have been left out. Olshausen regards the two clauses introduced by εἰς as a partition of the καταρτισμὸς τῶν ἁγίων : "for the perfecting of the saints, and that, on the one hand, of those furnished with gifts of teaching for the fulfilment of the teacher's office ; on the other hand, as regards the hearers, for the edifying of the church." Incorrectly, seeing that οἱ ἅγιοι are the *objects* of the teaching labors mentioned in ver. 11 and consequently cannot include the teachers themselves, and seeing, moreover, that the οἰκοδομὴ τοῦ σώμ. τοῦ Χρ. most appropriately describes the working of the *teacher*, so that no reader could, especially after εἰς ἔργ. διακ., conjecture that εἰς οἰκοδ. κ.τ.λ. was to apply to the *hearers*, inasmuch as no one could read the "on the one hand" and the "on the other" between the lines. Lastly, in quite an arbitrary and erroneous way, Grotius, Michaelis, Koppe have even assumed a trajection for εἰς ἔργ. διακ. πρὸς τὸν καταρτ. τῶν ἁγ. εἰς οἰκ. τοῦ σώμ. τοῦ Χρ., in connection with which there have been very various explanations.[5] — καταρτισμός, not elsewhere found in the N. T. (in Galen used of the adjustment of a dislocated limb), means, like κατάρτισις, 2 Cor. xiii. 9, *the putting of a person or thing into its perfect state*, so that it is as it should be (ἄρτιος). Vulgate :

---

[1] Theophylact.

[2] Ambrosiaster.

[3] Beza, Calvin, Zanchius, Grotius, Calixtus, and others, including de Wette.

[4] See on Acts xx. 28, and Ch. F. Fritzsche, in *Fritzschior. Opusc.* p. 42 ff.

[5] Chrysostom, Wolf, Bengel, Semler, Holzhausen, and others.

[6] If the three elements were parallel, Paul must logically have thus arranged them : (1) εἰς ἔργον διακονίας, (2) πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων, (3) εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ,—advancing from the less definite to the more definite.

[7] De Wette.

---

[1] Comp. also Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 128.

[2] Meier ; comp. Flatt, Schott, Rückert, Schenkel, and others, as already Erasmus.

[3] Flatt, Schott ; comp. also Zachariae.

[4] Rückert.

[5] Grotius : "ut sanctis ministrent eos perficiendo magis et magis . . . ut ad eum modum illi quoque sancti apti fiant aedificandae ecclesiae, *i.e.*, docendis aliis," "to minister to the saints by perfecting them more and more . . . so that in this way the saints also might become fit for edifying the church, *i.e.*, by teaching others." Michaelis : "that they should be able ministers of His church, in order that the saints might become more perfect, and His church, which is His body, might attain its due magnitude." Koppe : "ἔδωκε εἰς ἔργον διακονίας (εἰς τὸ διακονεῖν τοῖς ἁγίοις, 'to minister to the saints'), πρὸς τὸ καταρτίζειν αὐτούς," — and εἰς οἰκοδ. κ.τ.λ., is supposed to belong again to ἔδωκε.

ad consummationem.[1] — ἔργον διακονίας] does not stand for the simple διακονία,[2] but means *the work* of the διακονία, *i.e.*, the labor which is performed in the ministerial office of the church. — εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώμ. τοῦ Χρ.] *for the upbuilding* (= εἰς τὸ οἰκοδομεῖν τὸ σῶμ. τοῦ Χρ., comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 12 ; Eph. iv. 29) *of the body of Christ.* This *is* that ἔργον ; and so an appositional more precise definition of that which precedes. But on that account to take ἔργον as a *building*[3] is an undue anticipation. The expression οἰκοδομὴ τοῦ σώματος is a blending of two figures, both of which were, from what precedes, present in the conception of the apostle (i. 23, ii. 20 ff., iii. 6),—the church as the *body* of Christ and as an *edifice.* Comp. ver. 16.

Ver. 13. *Goal, up to the contemplated attainment of which* Christ has bestowed the different teachers, ver. 11, for the purpose specified in ver. 12. μέχρι is put *without* ἄν (comp. Mark xiii. 30) because the thought of conditioning circumstances is remote from the apostle's mind.[4] — καταντήσωμεν] *shall have attained* to unity, *i.e.*, *shall have reached* it as the goal. Comp. Acts xxvi. 7 ; Phil. iii. 11 ; 2 Macc. vi. 14 ; Polyb. iv. 34 ; Diod. Sic. i. 79, *al.* Some have found therein the coming *together* from different *places*,[5] or from different *paths of error* ;[6] but this is purely imported. — οἱ πάντες] *the whole*, in our *totality*, *i.e.*, the collective *body of Christians*, not *all men*,[7] *Jews and Gentiles*,[8] which is at variance with the use of the first person and with the preceding context (πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων). — εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστ. καὶ τῆς ἐπιγν. τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ] does not stand for ἐν τῇ ἑνότητι κ.τ.λ., "in the unity,"[9] but is that which is to be attained with the καταντ. The *article* is put with ἑνότ., because not *any* kind of unity is meant, but the *definite* unity, the future realization of which was the task of the teachers' activity, the definite ideal which was to be realized by it. — τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ is the *object*—accordant with their specific confession[10]—not only of the ἐπίγνωσις, but also of the πίστις (see on Rom. iii. 22 ; Gal. ii. 16). The goal then in question, to which the whole body of believers are to attain, is, that the πίστις in the Son of God and the full knowledge[11] of the Son of God may be in all one and the same ; no longer—as before the attainment of this goal—varying in the individuals in proportion to the influences of different teaching (ver. 14). καὶ τῆς ἐπιγν., however, is not to be taken as epexegesis of τῆς πίστ.,[12] which is precluded not by καί (see on Gal. iv. 16), but by the circumstance that there is no ground at all for the epexegetic view, and that πίστις and ἐπίγνωσις are *different* notions, although the two are mutually related, the former as the necessary condition of the latter (Phil. iii. 9, 10 ; 1 John iv. 16). Peculiar, but erroneous, is the view of Olshausen,[1] that the unity *between* faith and knowledge is to be understood, and that the development, of which Paul speaks, consists in *faith and knowledge becoming one*, *i.e.*, in the faith, with which the Christian life begins, becoming truly raised to knowledge. At variance with the context, since the connection speaks of the unity which is to combine the *different individuals* (ver. 3 ff.); and also opposed to the whole tenor of the apostle's teaching elsewhere, inasmuch as faith itself after the *Parousia* is not to cease as such (be merged in knowledge), but is to *abide* (1 Cor. xiii. 13). [See Note XLIII., p. 486.] — εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον] concrete figurative apposition to what precedes : *unto a full-grown man*, *sc.*, shall have attained, *i.e.*, shall have *at length grown up*, become ultimately developed into such an one.[2] The state of the unity of the faith, etc., is thought of as the full maturity of manhood ; to which the more imperfect state, wherein the ἑνότης is not yet attained (ver. 14), is opposed as a yet immature age of childhood. Comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 11. Paul does not say εἰς ἄνδρας τελείους, because he looks upon the πάντες as *one* ethical person; comp. ii. 15 f. On τέλειος, of the maturity of manhood, comp. 1 Cor. ii. 6, xiv. 20 ; Heb. v. 14.[3] — εἰς μέτρον κ.τ.λ.] second apposition, for the more precise definition of the former. *The measure of the age of the fulness of Christ* is the measure, which one has attained with the entrance upon that age to which the reception of the fulness of Christ is attached (see the further explanation below), or, *without a figure:* the degree of the progressive Christian development which conditions the reception of that fulness. The ἡλικία in question, namely, is conceived of as the section of a dimension in space, beginning at a definite place, so that the ἡλικία is attained only after one has traversed the measured extent, whose terminal point is the entrance into the ἡλικία.[4] ἡλικία, however, is not *statura* (Luke xix. 3), as is supposed by Erasmus, Beza, Homberg, Grotius, Calixtus, Erasmus Schmid, Wolf, Bengel, Zachariae, Rückert, and others, which would be suitable only if the ἀνὴρ τέλειος always had a definite measure of *bodily size ;* but it is equivalent to *aetas*, "*age*" (Matt. vi. 27), and that not, as it might in itself imply,[5] specially *aetas virilis*, "*the age of manhood*,"[6] since, on the contrary, the more precise definition of the *aetas*, "*age*," in itself indefinite, is only given by τοῦ πληρ. τ. Χρ., which belongs to it (Winer, p. 172); so that ἡλικία τοῦ πληρ. τ. Χρ. *taken together characterizes* the adult age of the Christians. [See Note XLIV., p. 486.]—τοῦ πληρώματος τ. Χρ.] defines the age which is meant, as that to which the fulness of Christ is peculiar, *i.e.*, *in which one receives the fulness of Christ*. Before the attainment thereof, *i.e.*, before one has attained to this degree of Christian perfection, one has received, indeed, individual and partial charismatic endowment from Christ, but not yet the *fulness*, the whole *largas copias*, "large supplies," of gifts of grace, which Christ communicates. πλήρωμα is here, just as at iii. 19, not the *church of Christ*,[1] which in i. 23 is doubtless so characterized, but not so named. This also in opposition to Baur, p. 438, according to whom τὸ πλήρ. τ. Χρ. means: "Christ's being filled, or the contents with which Christ fills Himself, thus the church." All explanations, moreover, which resolve πλήρωμα into an adjectival notion (πληρωθείς) are arbitrary changes of the meaning of the word and of its expressive representation, whether this adjectival notion be connected with ἡλικίας[2] or with τοῦ Χριστοῦ.[3] Grotius, doubtless, leaves πλήρ. as a substantive; but, at variance with linguistic usage, makes of it the *being full*, and of τ. Χρ.,[4] the *knowledge of Christ* ("ad eum staturae modum, qui est plenus Christi, *i.e.*, cognitionis de Christo," "to the measure of the stature that is full of Christ, *i.e.*, of knowledge concerning Christ"). Rückert takes πλήρωμα as *perfection*, and τοῦ Χριστοῦ as genitive of the *possessor*. The meaning of the word he takes to be: "We are to become just as perfect a man as Christ is." Christ stands before us as the ideal of manly greatness and beauty, the church not yet grown to maturity, but destined to be like Him, as perfect as He is,—which is a figure of *spiritual* perfection and completion. But πλήρωμα nowhere signifies *perfection* (τελειότης), and nowhere is Christ set forth, even in a merely figurative way, as an ideal of manly greatness and beauty. He stands there as *Head* of His body (vv. 12, 15, 16). As little, finally, as at iii. 19, does πλήρωμα τοῦ Χρ. here signify *the full gracious presence of Christ*.[5] So also Matthies: "the fulness of the Divinity manifest in Christ and through Him also embodied in the church." Where the πλήρωμα τοῦ Χρ. is communicated, there the full gracious presence of Christ *is* in man's heart (Rom. viii. 10; Gal. iii. 20), but *τὸ πλήρ. τοῦ Χρ.* does not *mean* this.

---

[1] Comp. Morus, and see καταρτίζω, Luke vi. 40 ; 1 Cor. i. 10 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 11 ; Heb. xiii. 21 ; 1 Pet. v. 10. Translations like *ad coagmentationem*, "for union" (Beza), and *ad instaurationem*, "for renewal" (Erasmus), would need to be suggested by the context. With strange inappropriateness, Pelagius and Vatablus have referred the καταρτισμός to the *number* of the Christians : "ad complendum numerum electorum," "for completing the number of the elect."

[2] Koppe ; see, on the other hand, Winer, p. 541 f.; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 117.

[3] Schellhorn in Wolf, Holzhausen.

[4] See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 14 ff.; Hartung, *Partikellehre*, II. p. 291 ff.

[5] Vatablus, Cornelius à Lapide, and others.

[6] Michaelis.

[7] Jerome, Morus, and others.

[8] Hammond.

[9] Grotius.

[10] The *sum* of the confession, in which all are to become one in faith and knowledge, —not merely, as Bleek turns it, are to *feel* themselves *one* in the communion of faith and of the knowledge of Christ.

[11] More than γνῶσις ; see Valckenaer *in Luc.* p. 14 f., and comp. on i. 17.

[12] Calvin, Calovius, and others.

---

[1] Whom Bisping has followed.

[2] The most involved way, in which the whole following passage can be taken, is to be found in Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 129 ff. He begins, in spite of the absence of a particle (οὖν or δέ), with εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον a new sentence, of which the verb is αὐξήσωμεν, ver. 15 ; the latter is a self-encouragement to growth ; but ἵνα μηκέτι κ.τ.λ. is dependent on αὐξήσωμεν. In this way, in place of the simple evolution of the discourse, such as is so specially characteristic of this Epistle, there is forced upon it an artificially-involved period, and there is introduced an exhortation as yet entirely foreign to the connection (only with ver. 17 does Paul return to the hortatory address).

[3] And Bleek thereon ; Plato, *Legg.* xi. p. 929 C, i. p. 643 D ; Xen. *Cyr.* i. 2. 4 ; Polyb. iv. 8. 1, v. 29. 2. Comp. also, for the figurative sense, Philo, *de agric.* I., p. 301, *Leg. ad Caium*, init.

[4] Comp. Hom. *Il.* xi. 225 : ἐπὶ ῥ' ἥβης ἐρικυδέος, ἵκετο μέτρον, *Od.* xi. 317 : εἰ ἥβης μέτρον ἵκοιτο, xviii. 217.

[5] Dem. 17. 11 ; 1352. 11 ; Xen. *Mem.* iv. 2. 3.

[6] So Morus, Koppe, Storr, Flatt, Matthies, Holzhausen, Harless, and others.

---

[1] Storr, Koppe, Stolz, Flatt, Baumgarten-Crusius.

[2] So Luther: "of the perfect age of Christ." Comp. Castalio, Calvin ("plena aetas," "full age"), Estius, Michaelis, and others; in which case τοῦ Χριστοῦ has by some been taken *sensu mystico*, "in a mystic sense," of the church, by others (see Morus and Rosenmüller) *ad quam Chr. nos ducit*, "to which Christ leads us," or the like, has been inserted.

[3] So most expositors, who take ἡλικία as *stature*. It is explained: *stature of the full-grown Christ*, as to which Beza says, "Dicitur . . . Christus non in sese, sed *in nobis* adolescere," "Christ is said to grow, not in Himself, but in us;" Wolf, on the other hand: "Christus . . . in exemplum proponitur corpori suo mystico, . . . ut, quemadmodum ipse qua homo se ostendit sapientia crescentem, prout annis et statura auctus fuit, ita fideles quoque sensim incrementa capiant in fide et cognitione, tandemque junctim perfectum virum Christo . . . similem sistunt," "Christ is set forth as an example to His mystical body . . . so that as He as man shows Himself growing in wisdom as He grew in years and stature, so believers also might gradually receive additions in faith and knowledge, and at length jointly present the perfect man in Christ." Comp. Erasmus, *Paraphr.*

[4] So already Oecumenius.

[5] Harless; comp. Holzhausen.

Remark 1.—The question whether the goal to be attained, indicated by Paul in ver. 13, is thought of by him as occurring in the *temporal* life, or only in the *αἰὼν μέλλων*, "world to come," is answered in the *former* sense by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Jerome, Ambrosiaster, Thomas, Luther, Cameron, Estius, Calovius, Michaelis, Morus, and others, including Flatt (who thinks of the last times of the church on earth), Rückert, Meier, de Wette, Schenkel; in the *latter* sense,[1] by Theodoret (*τῆς δὲ τελειότητος ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι βίῳ τευξόμεθα*), Calvin, Zanchius, Koppe, and others, including Holzhausen; while Harless judges that Paul sets forth the goal as the goal of the life of Christian fellowship here upon earth, but says nothing on the question as to whether it is to be attained here or in the life to come; as also Olshausen is of opinion that Paul had not even thought of the contrast between *here below* and *there*. But vv. 14, 15 show most distinctly that Paul thought of the goal in ver. 13 as setting in even *before the Parousia;* and to this points also the comparison of iii. 19, where, in substance, the same thing as is said at our passage by *εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας κ.τ.λ.*, is expressed by *ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ.* The development of the whole Christian community to the goal here described, Paul has thus thought of as *near at hand*, beyond doubt setting in (ver. 14) after the working of the antichristian principle preceding the Parousia,[2] as a consequence of this purifying process, and then the Parousia itself. We have consequently here a pointing to *the* state of unity of faith and knowledge,[3] which sets in after the last storms *τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ* (Gal. i. 4), and then is at once followed by the consummation of the kingdom of Christ by the Parousia.[4] With this view 1 Cor. xiii. 11 is not at variance, where the time *after* is compared with the age of manhood; the same figure is rather employed by Paul to describe *different* future conditions, according as the course of the discussion demanded. Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 20, iii. 1. On the other hand, *the* reason adduced *for* the reference to an earthly goal,[5] namely, that after the Parousia there is not faith, but sight, is invalid; for see on 1 Cor. xiii. 13.

Remark 2.—*Μέχρι καταντήσωμεν κ.τ.λ.* is not to be interpreted to the effect, that with the setting in of the unity, etc., the functions thought of in ver. 11 would *cease*,—which rather will be the case only at the Parousia (1 Cor. xiii. 8–10, iii. 13 ff.),—but the time of the unity, etc., is *itself included* in the (last) period of the duration of those churchly ministrations, so that only the Parousia is their terminus. The distinction made by Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 33 f., between ἄχρι and μέχρι—which in fact receive merely from the connection the determination of the point, whether the "until" is to be taken *inclusively* or *exclusively*—is invented.[1] The distinction of the two words lies not in the signification, but in the original sensuous mode of conception which was associated with the *until:* "quum altera particula spatium illud, quoad aliquid pertinere diceretur, metiretur ex altitudine, altera vero ex longitudine," "since one particle would measure the space, as to which anything would be said to pertain, from its height, but the other from its length," Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 225.

---

[1] In fact, Fathers of the church (Augustine, *de Civ.* ii. 15; and see also Jerome, *Epit. P.* 12) and scholastic writers (Anselm, Thomas) have referred our passage to the *resurrection of the dead*, of whom it is held to be here said, that they would all be raised in full manly age like Christ. Several (already Origen, as is asserted by Jerome, *ad Pammach. Ep.* 61, and afterwards Scotus) have even inferred that all women (with the exception of Mary) would arise of the male sex!

[2] See on vi. 11; Usteri, *Lehrbegr.* p. 348 f.

[3] This *ἐπίγνωσις* is consequently not yet the *perfect* one, which occurs after the Parousia, as it is described 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

[4] According to Schwegler, *l.c.* p. 381, our passage betrays the later author, who, taking a retrospective view from the Montanistic standpoint, could conceive the thought of such a division into epochs. As though *Paul himself*, looking forward from *his* view, as he expresses it, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. xii. 4 ff., could not also have hoped for a speedy development unto unity of the faith, etc.! The hypothesis of a "certain time-interest" (Baur) was not needed for this purpose.

[5] Calovius and Estius.

Ver. 14. Ἵνα] cannot, at all events, introduce the design of the *attained* goal in ver. 13, in opposition to which αὐξήσωμεν, ver. 15, clearly testifies; since, in the case of him who has already *become* the ἀνὴρ τέλειος, the αὐξάνειν no longer has place. But it is also arbitrary to refer the affirmation of aim *to* vv. 11, 12,[2] as Harless would do,[3] who holds ver. 13 and ver. 14 ff. as *co-ordinate*, so that ver. 13 describes the final goal up to which the arrangement endures, and ver. 14 ff. the design of this same. That ver. 14 stands in a *subordinate* relation to ver. 13, is shown by the retaining of the same figure, as by ἵνα itself, which is not preceded by another ἵνα, or something similar, to which it would be parallel. If Paul had referred ἵνα to vv. 11, 12, it would have been logically the most natural course to arrange the verses thus: vv. 11, 12, 14, 15, 13, 16. The relation of our sentence expressive of aim to the preceding is rather as follows: while in ver. 13 there was expressed the *terminus ad quem*, which is appointed to the labor-task, contained in ver. 12, of the teachers given according to ver. 11 by Christ, there is now adduced *that which is aimed at in the case with a view to the ultimate attainment of that terminus ad quem*, namely, the *change*, which meanwhile, in accordance with that final aim, is to take place in the—till then still current—condition of the church. This change, divinely aimed at, is characterized ver. 14 in its *negative* nature (μηκέτι κ.τ.λ.), and ver. 15 in its *positive* nature (ἀληθεύοντες δὲ κ.τ.λ.). — μηκέτι] *no longer*, as this is still at present the case. It points to the influence, which had at that time not yet ceased, of false teachers *in the Christian church at large* (see ver. 13). Of false teachers *in Ephesus itself* there is in our Epistle still no trace, although in Acts xx. 29 f. Paul had already expressed their future emergence. — νήπιοι] for, in order to attain to full maturity, one must first emerge out of the state of childhood. *What* Paul here represents as νηπιότης, namely, the dependence on false teachers, in connection with which the ἑνότης described in ver. 13 cannot set in, he himself expresses by κλυδωνιζόμενοι, *becoming tossed by waves* (Isa. lvii. 20) *and driven to and fro* (as a ship abandoned to the breakers), on which figurative representation of restless passive subjection to influences, comp. Heb. xiii. 9; Jas. i. 6; Jude 12 f.; Josephus, *Antt.* ix. 11. 3; Aristaenet. i. 27; Dio Chrys. *Orat.* 32. — παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλ.] τῇ τροπῇ δὲ ἐμμένων καὶ ἀνέμους ἐκάλεσε τὰς διαφόρους διδασκαλίας, "continuing the trope, he called differences of doctrine, winds," Theophylact. Comp. Plut. *de aud. poet.* p. 28 D : *μὴ παντὶ λόγῳ πλάγιον, ὥσπερ πνεύματι, παραδιδοὺς ἑαυτόν*, "lest presenting himself obliquely to every word, as to a breeze." The use of the *article* with *διδασκαλ.* denotes the doctrine *in abstracto*, "the abstract." In the fact that now this, now that, is taught according to varying tendencies, there blows now this, now that, *wind of doctrine*. That Paul has *false teachers* before his mind, is evident from the context. — *ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπ.*] *instrumental:* becoming tossed and driven to and fro by every wind of doctrine *in virtue of the deceit of men*. After *διδασκ.* *no* comma is to be placed.[1] *κυβεία*, from *κύβος* (*cubus*), *a die*, means properly *dice-play ;*[2] then in a derived signification *fraudulentia*, "deceit."[3] Comp. the German *Spiel*. In this signification the word has also passed over to the language of the Rabbins קוּבְיָא.[4] Others have explained it as : *levitas*, *temeritas*, "inconstancy, heedlessness,"[5]—which notion (like the German *auf's Spiel setzen : to put at stake*) *κυβεύειν* really expresses in Plat. *Prot.* p. 314 A ; Meleag. 73,[6]—but this is opposed to the context, which represents the false teachers as *deceivers*. — *τῶν ἀνθρώπων*] Instead of being under the gracious influence of *Christ* (ver. 13), and thereby becoming strong and firm (comp. iii. 16 ff.), one is given up to the deceptive play of *men !* — *ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης*] more precisely defining parallel to the preceding : *by means of cunning, which is effectual for the machination of error*. On *πανουργία*, comp. 1 Cor. iii. 19 ; 2 Cor. iv. 2, xi. 3 ; Plat. *Menex.* p. 247 A. *μεθοδεία* is preserved only here and vi. 11, but from the use of *μέθοδος*[7] and *μεθοδεύω*,[8] is not doubtful as to its signification. *πλάνη* means *error*, also at Matt. xxvii. 64 ; Rom. i. 27 ; 2 Pet. iii. 17, ii. 18 ; Jas. v. 20. Whether this has been brought about through the fault of lying and immorality[9] must be decided by the context, as this must in reality be assumed to be the thought of the apostle in the present case, both from the connection and from the view which Paul had formed on the basis of experience (not, as Rückert pronounces, from a certain dogmatical defiance, which had remained with him as his weak side ; comp. on the other hand, on 2 Cor. xi. 12) with regard to the false teachers of his time (2 Cor. ii. 17, xi. 13 f. ; Gal. ii. 4, vi. 12 ; Phil. ii. 21), although it is not involved in the word *in itself*. To take *πλάνη* as *seduction*[10] is not to be justified by linguistic usage, since it always (also 2 Thess. ii. 11) means error, delusion, going astray ; as with the Greek writers also it never has that active meaning.—*πλάνης* is *genitivus subjecti*, "a subjective genitive ;" the *πλάνη*, which *μεθοδεύει*, is *personified*, in which case, however, it would be quite arbitrary to say, with Bengel : *erroris, i.e., Satanae*, "of error, *i.e.*, of Satan." Compare rather the frequent personifications of *ἁμαρτία*, *δικαιοσύνη* (Rom. vi. 16 ff., *al.*), and the like. The article is not necessary before *πρὸς τ. μεθοδ.*,[1] since *πανουργ.* has no article; hence no reason whatever exists for attaching *πρὸς τ. μεθοδ. κ.τ.λ.*, with Rückert, to the participle ("driven about . . . according to the several arts of seduction"), by which *ἐν πανουργ.* is singularly isolated. — We may add that, when it is said that the fluctuation between different doctrinal opinions, here presupposed as a matter of fact, is not suitable to the apostolic age,[2] too much is asserted. Paul had experienced enough of this sort of wavering: all his Epistles testify of it.

---

[1] See Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 308 f.

[2] Koppe, Flatt; comp. Michaelis and Zanchius.

[3] Comp. Bleek.

---

[1] Comp. Lachmann and Tischendorf.

[2] Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 274 D ; Xen. *Mem.* i. 3. 2 ; Athen. x. p. 445 A.

[3] Arrian. *Epict.* ii. 19, iii. 21, and see Oecumenius.

[4] See Schoettgen, *Horae*, p. 775 ; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 1984.

[5] Beza, Salmasius, Morus, Flatt, and others.

[6] See Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VI. p. 89.

[7] 2 Macc. xiii. 18 ; Esth. xvi. 13 ; Plut. *Mor.* p. 176 A ; Artem. iii. 25 ; Aristaen. i. 17.

[8] 2 Sam. xix. 27 ; Aquila, Ex. xxi. 13 ; Diod. Sic. vii. 16 ; Charit. vii. 6.

[9] Harless.

[10] Luther, Beza, and others, including Rückert, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette.

Ver. 15. Still connected with *ἵνα*, ver. 14. — *δέ*] after the negative protasis: *on the other hand, yet doubtless.*[3] *In order that we . . . on the other hand, confessing the truth, may grow in love*, etc. *ἀληθεύειν* means nothing else than in Gal. iv. 6, *verum dicere*, "to speak the truth," opposite of *ψεύδεσθαι*,[4] which here, as contrast to the *περιφέρεσθαι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας*, is the confession of the *evangelic ἀλήθεια*. *ἐν ἀγάπῃ* belongs to *αὐξήσ.*,[5] the *ethical element* of which it denotes; for *love* (to the brethren) is the sphere, apart from which the growth of the mystic body, whose members are held together by love,[6] does not take place, iii. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 12 ff., comp. xiii. 1. With how great weight is this element here placed at the *beginning* and ver. 16 at the *end;* and how definitely is the hint already thereby given to take *ἐν ἀγάπῃ* together with *αὐξήσ.*, in keeping with its connection in ver. 16! *Others*, nevertheless, connect it with *ἀληθεύοντες*, in doing which some explain, yet not without diversities in specifying the sense,[7] *veritatem sectantes cum caritate*, "striving after truth with love;"[8] others: *sincere diligentes*, "sincerely loving."[9] But neither of these interpretations is to be linguistically justified, since *ἀληθεύειν* never means *to strive after* truth, or *to hold fast* the truth, *to possess* the truth, or the like, but always *to speak* the truth (comp. also Prov. xxi. 3; Ecclus. xxxi. 4), to which, likewise, the sense of *to verify*, to prove as true, found *e.g.* in Xen. *Anab.* vii. 7. 25, Isa. xliv. 26, may be traced back. Against the second of these interpretations[10] there is also in particular the context, seeing that *sincere love* would be a quite unsuitable contrast to the spiritual immaturity given up to the false teachers, which is described ver. 14. If, however, we should seek to connect *ἀληθεύειν* in the correct sense of *verum dicere*, "to speak the truth," with *ἐν ἀγάπῃ* (*confessing the truth in love*), then only the love not towards others in general,[1] but towards those *of another confession*, could be meant ; and this too, would here, where the latter are described as deceptive teachers of error, be at variance with the context. Harless, it is true, rightly connects ἐν ἀγάπῃ with αὐξήσ., but explains ἀληθεύοντες : *being true in evangelical disposition*, and then brings ἐν ἀγάπῃ εἰς αὐτόν together. Against this may be urged, not indeed the hyperbaton,[2] but the fact that ἀληθ. is not taken in accordance with correct linguistic usage, and that the definition "*in evangelical disposition*," is imported at variance with the context (since we have here a contrast not to the πανουργία of the false teachers, but to the childish περιφέρεσθαι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ κ.τ.λ.) ; as also that the corresponding ἐν ἀγάπῃ of ver. 16 shows that ἐν ἀγάπῃ in ver. 15 does not mean love *to Christ*. Wrongly also Baumgarten-Crusius, although connecting with αὐξ., renders : *possessing* the truth. — αὐξήσωμεν] dependent on ἵνα, ver. 14, is not to be taken, according to classic usage, *transitively* (1 Cor. iii. 6 f. ; 2 Cor. ix. 10), as Valla, Moldenhauer, and others held, but *intransitively* (comp. ii. 21, and see Wetstein, I. p. 335), *to grow ;* for, in keeping with the figure ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι, it represents *the progressive development of the Christian life*. Comp. ver. 16. Bengel aptly observes : "haec αὔξησις . . . *media est inter infantes et virum*," "this increase is between childhood and manhood." — εἰς αὐτόν] *in reference to Him*. Christ is indeed the Head of the body, the growth of the members of which thus stands in constant *relation to Christ*, can never take place apart from relation to Him as determining and regulating it, to whom the course of the development must harmoniously correspond. The commentary to εἰς αὐτόν is furnished by the following ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα κ.τ.λ. ; the relation of the growth to the head, which is expressed in an ascending direction by εἰς αὐτόν, is expressed in a descending direction by ἐξ οὗ.[3] The sense : *into the resemblance of Christ*,[4] is opposed to the context (since Christ is thought of as *head*) ; as also the explanation of Koppe and Holzhausen :[5] "*to grow up in Him*," is inappropriate, since the body as little *grows up* to the head, or *reaches forth* to the head,[6] as it grows into the head.[7] Others have taken εἰς for ἐν,[8] but this was a mistaken make-shift, whether it was explained with Cornelius à Lapide : "Christi capitis *virtute et influxu*," "by the virtue and influence of Christ as Head," or even with Grotius : "ipsius *cognitione*," "by his knowledge." — τὰ πάντα] is rightly explained : *in all points, in every respect* (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 25, x. 33, xi. 2, and see on Acts xx. 35), in which case, however, the article has not generally been attended to.[9] Harless refers it to the previously mentioned ἑνότης in its contrast to the wavering of unsettled knowledge. But since the ἑνότης of ver. 12 appears as the *goal* to be attained by the growth, and since, moreover, not *several things* (a plurality) are thereby denoted, to which the *plural* τὰ πάντα might relate, this view cannot appear in keeping with the context. The explanation which most naturally suggests itself is: in all the points of our growth, wherein the emphasis remains upon εἰς αὐτόν. Our growth shall, in all points in which we grow, proceed *in relation to Him*, who is the Head, etc. Koppe, Wahl, and Holzhausen regard τὰ πάντα as *nominative*, explaining it of all the *members*. But in that case οἱ πάντες must have been written. Comp. ver. 13. — ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ Χριστός] significant more precise definition and very emphatic naming of the subject intended by εἰς αὐτόν, although this subject was self-evident. Paul did not write τὸν Χριστόν (as apposition to αὐτόν), but in accordance with the usual Greek construction he drew the apposition into the accessory clause.[1] According to de Wette, ὁ Χρ. is merely to serve for facilitating the construction with the following ἐξ οὗ, and thus to have merely a formal significance. But of such a facilitating there was no need whatever.

---

[1] In opposition to Rückert.

[2] Baur, p. 448.

[3] See Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 171 f.; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 360 f.

[4] Comp. Xen. *Anab.* i. 7. 18, iv. 4. 15; *Mem.* i. 15; Plat. *Demod.* p. 383 C; Phil. *Leg. Alleg.* II. p. 84 A; *de resip. Noë*, p. 280 E.

[5] Comp. already Lucifer: "crescamus in caritate," "let us grow in love."

[6] Comp. Chrysostom.

[7] Calvin and most expositors: "veritatis studio adjungere etiam mutuae communicationis studium, ut placide simul proficiant," "to the pursuit of truth to add also the pursuit of mutual communication, that they may advance together calmly." Castalio, Bullinger, Rückert: "*to hold fast* to the truth received and investigated . . . so that . . . our firmness may be tempered by a friendly consideration for the weaker."

[8] Valla, Erasmus, Calvin, Bullinger, Calovius, Wolf, Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, Stolz, Flatt, Rückert, Bleek, de Wette? *et al.*

[9] Luther, Bucer, Grotius, Loesner, Morus, *et al.;* comp. also Beza and Matthies.

[10] Luther, etc.

---

[1] This in opposition to Hofmann.

[2] Bernhardy, p. 460 ; Kühner, II. p. 627 f.

[3] This treating of εἰς αὐτόν and (ver. 16) ἐξ οὗ as parallel is not "paradoxical" (de Wette), but represents the relation *as it is*. —Christ the *goal* and *source* of the development of life in the church, *i.e.*, to Christ withal is directed the whole aim which determines this development, and from Christ proceeds all endowment, by which it is rendered possible and takes place. Analogous, and just as little paradoxical, is the conjunction of ἐν (διά) and εἰς, Col. i. 16 f.

[4] Zanchius and others.

[5] Comp. de Wette and Bleek.

[6] Hofmann.

[7] In opposition to Matthies : "*to grow into Him*, *i.e.* . . . ever more deeply to become absorbed into His infinitely true and holy nature.

[8] Luther, in the original editions, has not : "an *dem* das Haupt ist," but "an *den*, der das Haupt ist."

[9] So still Meier and Matthies.

Ver. 16. Harmony of what is said, ver. 15, for all *individuals*, with the objective relation of Christ to the whole as the organism growing by way of unity out of Christ. Comp. Col. ii. 19. — *From whom the whole body, becoming fitly framed together and compacted* (*becomes* compacted *and*), *by means of each sensation of the supply* (of Christ), *according to an operation proportionate to the measure of each several part, bringeth about the growth of the body, to the edifying of itself in love.* — ἐξ οὗ] is equivalent neither to εἰς ὅν,[2] nor to *per quem*, "through whom,"[3] but denotes the *causal going forth*, as Col. *l.c.;* 1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 1, xiii. 4; and frequently.[4] — πᾶν τὸ σῶμα] πᾶν has the emphasis: *the whole* body, thus no member being excepted; it glances back to οἱ πάντες, ver. 13. — συναρμολ. κ. συμβιβαζ.] *Present* participle, expressing what was continuously *in actu*, "in act." As to συναρμολ., comp. on ii. 21; συμβιβάζω is employed by classical writers of *men* or of single parts of things, which one *brings together* into an alliance, to reconciliation, to a unity,[5] and might be employed here the more aptly, inasmuch as the single parts of which the collective mass designated by πᾶν τὸ σῶμα consists, are the different Christian individuals. A distinction in the notion of the two words, such as is asserted by Bengel (συναρμολ. denotes the *fitting* together, and συμβιβ. the *fastening* together) and Grotius (the latter denotes a *closer* union than the former), is arbitrarily assumed. The distinction consists only in this, that συναρμολ. corresponds to the *figure*, and συμβιβ. to the *thing* figuratively represented. With regard to the former, observe that ἁρμονία also, with the Greeks often denotes the harmonious relation of unity between the body and its parts.[6] — The *verb* to ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ

---

[1] See Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Apol.* p. 41 A: εὑρήσει τοὺς ὡς ἀληθῶς δικαστάς, οἵπερ καὶ λέγονται ἐκεῖ δικάζειν Μίνως τε καὶ Ῥαδάμανθος καὶ Αἴακος. Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 771. Comp. 2 Cor. x. 13; Winer, p. 469; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 368.

[2] Koppe.

[3] Morus, Flatt, Holzhausen.

[4] See Bernhardy, p. 225.

[5] Herod i. 74; Thuc. ii. 29. 5; Plato, *Rep.* p. 504 A; comp Col. ii. 2.

[6] See Jacobs, *Delect. epigr.* vii. 39.

σῶμα συναρμ. κ. συμβιβ. is *τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ σώμ. ποιεῖται*, in which the repetition of *τοῦ σώματος* is neither negligence [1] nor a Hebraism,[2] but is introduced *for the sake of perspicuity* on account of the intervening definitions, as is often the case with classical writers.[3] — *διὰ πάσης ἁφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγ.*] belongs not to *συμβιβαζ.* (so *ordinarily*), to which connection the erroneous interpretation of *ἁφή* as *band* (see below) led, but to *τὴν αὔξησιν ποιεῖται.*[4] It is not the *union* that is brought about by the *ἁφαὶ τῆς ἐπιχορηγ.*, but the *growth*, inasmuch as Christ, from whom as Head the union proceeds, bestows the *ἐπιχορηγία* for the growth. *ἁφή* is *usually* explained *junctura*, "joining,"[5] *commissura*, *means of connection*, *joint*, and the like. But without any support from linguistic usage. It may signify[6] *contact*, also *holding fast*, *adhesion*, and the like,[7] but it never means *vinculum*, "bond" (*συναφή*). Rightly Chrysostom and Theodoret have already explained it by *αἴσθησις*, *feeling*, *perception*.[8] Hofmann[9] prefers the signification : *contact*, and understands the connection of the several parts of the body, whereby the one supplies to the other that which is necessary to growth, which supply in the case of the recipient takes place by means of contact with it. In this way *πᾶσα ἁφὴ τῆς ἐπιχορηγ.* would be every contact *which serves for supplying*, and the *ἐπιχορηγία* would be the communication of the requisites for growth *by one part of the body to the other*. But the former Paul would have very indistinctly expressed by the mere genitive (instead of *τῆς ἐπιχορ.* he might have written *τῆς πρὸς τὴν ἐπιχορηγαίν*), and the latter is imported, since the reader after *ἐξ οὗ* could only understand the *ἐπιχορηγία* proceeding *from Christ*. If we were to take *ἁφή* in the sense of *contact*, the above explanation of Oecumenius would be the simplest (every contact, which the body experiences through the *ἐπιχορηγία* of Christ) ; but there may be urged against it, that the expression instead of the mere *διὰ πάσης ἐπιχορηγίας* would be only diffuse and circumstantial without special reason, while the expression : "*sensation* of the *ἐπιχορηγία*," very appropriately points to the growth through the influence of Christ *from within outward*. [See Note XLV., p. 486.] — *τῆς ἐπιχορηγ.*] Genit. *objecti*, "objective genitive :" every feeling in which the supply is perceived, experienced. *What* supply is meant by the *ἐπιχορηγία* with the article becomes certain from the context, namely, that which is *afforded by Christ* (through the Holy Spirit), *i.e.*, the influence of Christ, by which He supplies to His body the powers of life and development necessary to a growth in keeping with its destiny (ἐπιχορηγεῖ, 2 Cor. ix. 10 ; Gal. iii. 5, *exhibet*, "presents ;" the substantive occurs only further at Phil. i. 19, not in Greek writers). Those who understand ἁφή as *bond*, take τῆς ἐπιχορηγ., partly correctly in this same sense,[1] save that they explain the genitive as a genitive of *apposition*, partly[2] of the *reciprocal* service-rendering of the *members*,—an explanation which,[3] originating in the erroneous interpretation of ἁφή, introduces into the context something heterogeneous. Beza transmutes τῆς ἐπιχορηγ. into an unmeaning participle : "per omnes *suppeditatas* commissuras," "through all supplied joints." — κατ' ἐνέργ. ἐν μέτρῳ ἑνὸς ἑκ. μέρ.] belongs neither to τῆς ἐπιχορηγ.,[4] in which case, it is true, the non-repetition of the article might be justified on the ground of a blending of ἡ ἐπιχορηγία κατ' ἐνέργειαν κ.τ.λ. into *one* conception, but on the other hand may be urged the fact that ἐν μέτρῳ κ.τ.λ., as a specification of *measure*, points of itself to the *growth*, not to the ἐπιχορηγία ; nor to συμβιβαζ.,[5] to which even what precedes did not belong, but : after Paul has stated *whereby* the body grows (διὰ πάσ. ἁφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγ.), he now also adds the *relation in which* it brings about its growth, namely, *according to an efficacy in keeping with the measure of each several part*, *i.e.*, so that the growing body in its growth follows an activity of development in keeping with the measure peculiar to each several part of the body,—consequently no disproportioned monstrous growth results, but one which is *pursuant to proportion*, adapted to the varied measure of the several parts (so that, *e.g.*, the hand does not grow disproportionately larger than the foot, etc.). *Without figure :* From Christ the church accomplishes its progressive development according to an efficacy, which is not equal in all individuals, but appropriate to the degree of development appointed for each several individual. Rückert and Bretschneider take κατ' ἐνέργειαν adverbially : *after a powerful manner*. But ἐνέργεια *in itself* does not denote *powerful* working, but *efficacy*, *activity* in general, so that it would need a more precise definition for the sense supposed (i. 19, iii. 7 ; Phil. iii. 21 ; Col. i. 20, ii. 12 ; 2 Thess. ii. 9, 11). — ἐν μέτρῳ] *according to measure*, *pro mensura ;* see Bernhardy, p. 211 ; Winer, p. 345. — μέρους] is held by Harless to denote the several parts, which again in their turn appear as *having the control of the other members* (pastors, etc., ver. 11). Against this is ἑνὸς ἑκάστου. It denotes, according to the context, in contradistinction to the *whole* of the body each *part of the body*, whether this part may be a whole member or in turn only a portion of a member (comp. Luke xi. 36), and is hence of *wider meaning* than μέλους. — αὔξησιν] in the N. T. only further at Col. ii. 19, often with Greek writers,[6] also 2 Macc. v. 16. — ποιεῖται] *produces for itself* (*sibi*), hence the *middle ;* comp. subsequently εἰς

---

[1] Rückert.

[2] Grotius.

[3] See Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc.* p. xxxv.; Krüger, *Anab.* p. 27; Ellendt, *ad Arrian. Exp. Al.* i. 55.

[4] Zanchius, Bengel, and others.

[5] Vulgate.

[6] As in Lucian, *de luctu* 9, and often in Plutarch.

[7] In virtue of this signification there was denoted by *ἁφή* also the fine sand with which the oiled athletes sprinkled each other, in order to be able to take a firm grasp (see Steph. *Thesaur. s.v.*). Thence Bengel derives the interpretation : *ansae ad mutuum auxilium*, "handle for mutual aid." An arbitrary abstraction from a conception entirely foreign to the context. Comp. Augustine, *de civ. Dei*, xxii. 18 : "*tactum subministrationis*," "contact for supply," and see Oecumenius : ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ κατιοῦσα πνευματικὴ δύναμις ἑνὸς ἑκάστου μέλους αὐτοῦ ἁπτομένη, "the spiritual power coming from Christ, laying hold of each one of His members."

[8] See Plato, *Locr.* p. 100 D, E; *Pol.* vii. p. 523 E; and the passages in Wetstein. So also Col. ii. 19.

[9] *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 132.

---

[1] Rückert, Harless, Olshausen.

[2] So Luther and most expositors, including Matthies, Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette.

[3] In which case the genitive τῆς ἐπιχ. would have to be taken, with Grotius, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others, as genitive of definition (*on behalf of*). But see above, in opposition to Hofmann.

[4] Koppe, Meier, de Wette, and many.

[5] Harless [and Engelhardt].

[6] More classic, however, is αὔξη. See Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* vi. p. 509 B.

οἰκοδομ. ἑαυτοῦ. — The sense : *for the perfecting of itself* (aim of *τὴν αὔξησ. ποιεῖται*), is expressed, as at ver. 12, in *another*, *dissimilar*, but likewise very familiar figure, by *εἰς οἰκοδ. ἑαυτοῦ.* — *ἐν ἀγάπῃ*] *Love* of all one to another is the ethical sphere, within which the *αὔξησιν ποιεῖσθαι εἰς οἰκοδ. ἑαυτοῦ* on the part of the whole body proceeds—outside of which this cannot take place. Comp. ver. 15. On account of ver. 15, the connection with *τὴν αὔξησιν ποιεῖται εἰς οἰκοδ. ἑαυτοῦ* is more in keeping with the context than the usual one with the mere *εἰς οἰκοδ. ἑαυτοῦ.* — We may add, that the mode of regarding the church in our passage is not "genuinely Gnostic," as Baur pronounces, but genuinely Pauline. Comp. especially 1 Cor. xii. 14–27.

Ver. 17. That *οὖν*, like the Latin *ergo*, here resumes ver. 1,[1] is rightly assumed ; since the exhortation begun vv. 1–3 is really interrupted by the digression, vv. 4–16, and the duty now following *μηκέτι περιπατεῖν κ.τ.λ.*, is but the negative side of the *ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι κ.τ.λ.* of ver. 1. Theodoret aptly observes : *πάλιν ἀνέλαβε τῆς παραινέσεως τὸ προοίμιον*, "again he recurred to the beginning of the exhortation." — *τοῦτο*] to be referred forwards : *What follows then* (now to return to my exhortations) *I say and asseverate*, etc. — *μαρτύρομαι* does not signify *obsecro*, "*I beseech*," but I *testify*, *i.e.*, I *asseverate*, *aver*. See on Gal. v. 3. Since, however, there lies in this expression and in *λέγω* the notion of *exhortation* and *precept*, there is no need of supplying *δεῖν* to the following infinitive.[2] — *ἐν κυρίῳ*] not *per Dominum*, "*by the Lord*,"[3] which would be *πρὸς κυρίου* (comp. on Rom. ix. 1), and with *μαρτύρομαι* would have to be denoted by *τὸν κύριον* ;[4] but rather, as at Rom. ix. 1, 1 Thess. iv. 1 : *in the Lord*, so that Paul expresses that not in respect of his own individuality does he speak and aver, but that Christ withal is the element, in which his thinking and willing moves,—through which, therefore, the *λέγω* and *μαρτύρ.* has its distinctively Christian character. — *μηκέτι*] after that ye, from being Gentiles, have become Christians. — *καθὼς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη κ.τ.λ.*] The *καί* has its reference in the former walk of *the readers*. These are no longer to have such a walk, as was, like *their* previous walk, that also of the *other*, *i.e.*, the still unconverted (comp. ii. 3 ; 1 Thess. iv. 13) Gentiles. — *τὰ λοιπά*] for the readers, although Christians, belonged *nationally* to the category of Gentiles. — *ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν*] (not *αὑτῶν*) is the subjective sphere, in which the walk of the other Gentiles takes place, namely, in *nothingness* (truthlessness) *of their thinking and willing* (*νοῦς*), which, however, neither denotes, after the Hebrew הֶבֶל, *idol-worship*,[5] nor is it to be referred, with Grotius, especially to the *philosophers* (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 20), but is to be understood *of the whole intellectual and moral character* (comp. 2 Pet. ii. 18) of heathenism, in which the rational and moral principle (the *νοῦς*) is theoretically and practically estranged from the truth (ver. 18), and subject to error and the service of sin (ver. 19). We may add, that the *ματαιότης* is not an *inborn* one,[1] but (Rom. vii. 7 ff.) one *that has come to pass*, although it has come to pass *φύσει* (ii. 3). Comp. Rom. i. 21, ii. 15.

---

[1] Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 22 f. : Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 718.

[2] See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 2. 1 ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 235 [E. T. 273] ; also Heind. *ad Plat. Prot.* p. 346 B.

[3] Theodoret : *ὑπὸ μάρτυρι γάρ φησι τῷ κυρίῳ ταῦτα λέγω*, "He says, 'I say this with the Lord as witness ;'" so already Chrysostom and most expositors, including Koppe, Flatt, Olshausen.

[4] I call the Lord to witness, Plat. *Phil.* p. 12 B ; Eur. *Phoen.* 629 ; Soph. *Oed. Col.* 817.

[5] See, in opposition to this, Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* i. 21.

Ver. 18 exhibits the ground of the fact, that the Gentiles walk *ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν*, which ground is twofold according to the twofold power belonging to the *νοῦς*, the *intelligent* and the *practical*. To the *former* *ἐσκοτωμένοι* relates (see the critical remarks), to the *latter* *ἀπηλλ. τ. ζωῆς τ. Θεοῦ* : *since they are darkened*[2] *in respect of their exercise of thinking and willing* (*διανοίᾳ*, comp. Luke i. 51 ; Col. i. 21 ; 1 Pet. i. 13 ; 1 John v. 20) ; *estranged from the life of God.* — *ἐσκοτ. . . . ὄντες* is to be taken together,[3] since, if *ὄντες ἀπηλλοτρ.* are joined,[4] the logical and formal parallelism is disturbed, inasmuch as then *ἐσκοτ. τῇ διανοίᾳ* would be merely predicate and *ὄντες ἀπηλλοτρ.* specifying the reason (subordinate to the former), and the emphatic prefixing of the two perfect participles, as brought into prominence by our punctuation, would go for nothing. And that the second clause does *not* specify the reason, why the darkening has come over the minds of the Gentiles,[5] is clear from the following *διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν κ.τ.λ.*, wherein, conversely, the ignorance is indicated as the cause of the estrangement from God. Rückert, moreover, thinks that, according to our punctuation, *ὄντες* would stand *before* *τῇ διανοίᾳ* ; but this is groundless, since *ἐσκοτ. τῇ διανοίᾳ* is conceived of *together*.[6] — *ἀπηλλοτρ.*] See on ii. 12, and, concerning the *constructio* *κατὰ σύνεσιν*, Buttmann, *neut. Gram.* pp. 114, 242 [E. T. 281]. — *τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ*] *from the life of God*, does not admit of any explanation, according to which *ζωή* would be *life-walk*, which it never means in the N. T., not even in 2 Pet. i. 3.[7] Hence not : *the life pleasing to God*,[8] but, as Luther aptly renders : "*the life, which is from God.*" The genitive is the genitive *originis*, "of origin" (comp. *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ*, Rom. i. 17, and see Winer, p. 167 f.), and *ζωή* is the counterpart of *θάνατος*, so that it is to be understood as : "tota vita spiritualis, quae in hoc seculo per fidem et justitiam inchoatur et in futura beatitudine perficitur, quae tota peculiariter vita Dei est, quatenus a Deo per gratiam datur," "the entire spiritual life, which is begun in this world through faith and righteousness, and perfected in future blessedness, which entire life is peculiarly God's, as it is given by God through grace," Estius.[9] It is at all events *the life of Christian regeneration*, which is wrought by God in believers through the Spirit (Rom. viii. 2) ;[10] while the Gentiles are by their heathen nature alien to this divine life.

---

[1] Zanchius, Calovius, and others ; comp. Calvin.

[2] Comp. Joseph. *Antt.* ix. 4. 3 ; the opposite : φωτίζειν τὴν διάνοιαν, viii. 5. 3.

[3] Clem. Al. *Protrep.* ix. p. 69, Potter ; Theodoret, Bengel, Knapp, Lachmann, Harless, de Wette.

[4] Beza and many, including Rückert, Meier, Matthies, Scholz.

[5] In opposition to Rückert.

[6] Comp. Herod. i. 35 : οὐ καθαρὸς χεῖρας ἐών, Xen. *Ages.* xi. 10 : πραότατος φίλοις ὤν.

[7] Especially instructive for the distinction of the notion ζωή from that of life-*walk*, is Gal. v. 25.

[8] Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, Morus, and others ; comp. Theodore, Theophylact, Grotius, and Flatt.

[9] Comp. Calvin and Cajetanus.

[10] This divine making alive does not coincide with justification, but the latter is the *actus judicialis*, "judicial act," of God that precedes the former. Comp. especially Rom. viii. 10 : ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην.

This in opposition to Harless, who understands it as the estrangement *from the life and light of the λόγος in the world* (John i. 3). Paul in fact is speaking of the Gentiles *of that time* (not of those who have lived in the time *before Christ*), in their contrast to the Christians (ver. 17) as persons who were partakers of divine life through the παλιγγενεσία (comp. ii. 5 ; Rom. vi. 4). Various elements are mixed up by Beza : "vitam illam, qua Deus *vivit* in suis quamque *praecipit et approbat*," "the life whereby God lives in His own people, and which He commands and approves ;" and Olshausen : "the life, which God Himself *is* and *has*, and which *pertains* to the creature so long as it remains in fellowship with God." — διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν . . . καρδίας αὐτῶν] *on account of*, etc. ; the *cause* of this estrangement of the Gentiles from the divine life is the *ignorance* which is in them through *hardening of heart*, consequently due to their own fault. διά τ. πώρ. τ. κ. attaches itself to τὴν οὖσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς, and is consequently subordinated to the preceding διὰ τ. ἄγνοιαν τ. οὖσ. ἐν αὐτ. *Usually* διὰ . . . διά are regarded as *co-ordinate* elements ; and indeed, according to Harless and Olshausen, who are followed by de Wette, this twofold specification of reason has reference not merely to ἀπηλλοτρ. τ. ζ. τ. Θ., but also to ἐσκοτ. τῇ διανοίᾳ ὄντες, in which case Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Schenkel[1] assume that διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν κ.τ.λ. corresponds to ἐσκοτ. κ.τ.λ., and then διὰ τὴν πώρωσιν κ.τ.λ. to ἀπηλλοτρ. τ. ζ. τ. Θ. The ἄγνοια, however, cannot be the *cause*, but only the *consequence* of ἐσκοτ. τῇ διανοίᾳ, since ἄγνοια (used by Paul only here, but ἀγνοεῖν occurs frequently) is not *dulness of the higher faculty of cognition*,[2] but nothing else than *ignorance* (Acts iii. 17, xvii. 30 ; 1 Pet. i. 14). The Gentiles were not *darkened* on account of their ignorance, seeing that in fact ignorance is not inaccessible to the light, as the example of all *converted* Gentiles shows ; but *their being estranged from the life of God* was occasioned by their ignorance, and, indeed, by their ignorance for which they were to blame on account of hardening of heart. Accordingly, the commas after Θεοῦ and αὐτοῖς are to be deleted. Meier is quite wrong in holding that the ignorant are the Gentiles, and the hardened the Jews. Paul speaks *only* of the Gentiles. [See Note XLVI., p. 486.] — τὴν οὖσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς] not : *quae iis innata est*, "which is innate to them," nor yet said *in contrast to external occasions*,[3] which is not at all implied in the context, but : because Paul wished to annex the cause of the ἄγνοια, he has not put διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν αὐτῶν, but, in order to procure the means of annexation, has employed the participial expression paraphrasing the αὐτῶν : τὴν οὖσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς. This expression confirms the view that the second διά is *subordinate* to the first.

Ver. 19. The estrangement of the Gentiles from the divine life, indicated in ver. 18, is now more precisely proved in conformity with experience : οἵτινες, *quippe qui*, etc. : *being such as, void of feeling, have given themselves over to lasciviousness*. — ἀπηλγηκότες] ἀναίσθητοι γενόμενοι, "being senseless," Hesychius. The "verbum significantissimum," "a most significant word,"[4] from ἀλγεῖν and ἀπό, is equivalent to *dedolere*, to cease to feel pain, then to be

---

[1] Comp. Grotius and Bengel.

[2] Rückert.

[3] Harless.

[4] Bengel.

void of feeling, whether there be meant by it the apathy of intelligence, or the state of despair, or, as here, the *moral* indolence, in which one has ceased to feel reproaches of conscience,[1] consequently the *securitas carnalis*, "carnal security;" see Wetstein, and also Matthiae, ed. min. *in loc.* The explanation *having despaired*[2] imports a special definition of the meaning without warrant from the context, but is found already in Syr. Arm. Vulg. It. Ambrosiaster, and from it has arisen the reading ἀπηλπικότες (D E F G have ἀφηλπικ.), which probably already those vss. followed. — ἑαυτούς] with deterrent emphasis. To bring into prominence what was done *on the part of their own freedom*, was here in accordance with the *paraenetic* aim. It is otherwise put at Rom. i. 24: παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεός. The two modes of regarding the matter are not *contrary* to one another, but go *side by side* (see on Rom. i. 24); and according to the respective aims and connection of the discourse, both have their warrant and their full truth. — τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ] personified. It is to be understood of *sensual* lasciviousness (comp. on Rom. xiii. 13; 2 Cor xii. 21; Gal. v. 19), as, subsequently, ἀκαθαρσίας of *sensual* filthiness (comp. Rom. i. 24; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Gal. v. 19), not of ethical wantonness and impurity generally,[3] since the πλεονεξία connected with it is likewise a *special* vice, as indeed, on the other hand (Rom. i. 24; comp. ver. 29 and Col. iii. 5), unchastity appears as the first and chief vice of the Gentiles. — εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης] aim of this self-surrender to the ἀσέλγεια (comp. Rom. vi. 19): *for the prosecution of every uncleanness*, in order to practise every sort of uncleanness.[4] Koppe takes it as *trade* (Acts. xvi. 16, xix. 19, xxiv. 29). But could the *trade* of prostitution[5] be thus generally predicated with truth of the Gentiles? This at the same time tells in opposition to the explanation followed by Grotius, Bengel, Stolz, Koppe, Flatt, and Meier, of the ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ that follows as *quaestus ex impudicitia*, "profit from lewdness" (on the thing itself, see Aristaen. i. 14). In fact, ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ adds to the vice of sensuality the other chief vice of the heathen, and signifies: *with covetousness.* The explanations: *with unsatiableness*,[6] or *certatim*, "emulously,"[7] or *with haughtiness*,[8] or *in gluttony*,[9] are all of them at variance with linguistic usage, partly in general, partly of the N. T. in particular, in which πλεονεξία never means anything else than *covetousness*. *Sensuality* and *covetousness* are the two cardinal vices of the heathen, which are to be avoided by the Christians. See v. 3 ; 1 Cor. v. 10 f. ; Col. iii. 5. Comp. 2 Pet. ii. 2, iii. 14.

---

[1] "Homines a Deo relicti sopita conscientia, extincto divini judicii timore, amisso denique sensu tanquam attoniti, belluino impetu se ad omnem turpitudinem projiciunt," "men abandoned of God, with conscience stupefied, with the fear of divine judgment extinguished, and finally with sensibility lost, as though struck by lightning, with bestial impulse cast themselves headlong into every form of disgrace," Calvin.

[2] Comp. Polyb. ix. 40. 4: ἀπαλγοῦντες ταῖς ἐλπίσι.

[3] Harless, Matthies, Meier, and others.

[4] On ἐργασία, comp. LXX. Ex. xxvi. 1; 2 Chron. xv. 7; Isa. i. 31, *al.;* Plat. *Prot.* p. 353 D: τῆς ἡδονῆς ἐργασίαν, "prosecution of pleasure," *Eryx.* p. 403 E: ἐργασίας πραγμάτων μοχθηρῶν, "prosecution of evil deeds."

[5] Dem. 270. 15, Reiske, and thereon Dissen, *de Cor.* p. 301.

[6] Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Calvin, Estius, and others, including Matthies.

[7] "Quasi agatur de lucro, ita alius alium superare contendat," "as though he treats of gain, whereby one vies to excel another," Beza.

[8] Holzhausen,

[9] Harless. He is followed by Olshausen, who explains πλεονεξία of repletion with meat and drink, and terms this *physical greed!* According to classical usage, πλεονεξία might mean *superabundance*, but not *gluttony*.

Ver. 20. Ὑμεῖς δέ] opposed to the unconverted Gentiles. — οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν] but ye *have not in such manner* (so that this instruction would have directed you to that Gentile conduct of life, ver. 17 ff.) *learned Christ.* Observe the *litotes* in οὐχ οὕτως (*quite otherwise*, comp. Deut. xviii. 14). The proposal of Beza : "Quid si post οὕτως distinctionem adscribas ?" "suppose you put a punctation mark after οὕτως ?" [so Hofmann and Braune], is, although adopted by Gataker and Colomesius, quite mistaken, since ver. 21 contains the confirmation not of the mere fact ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν, but of the *mode in which* the readers have learned Christ, hence οὐχ οὕτως must necessarily belong to ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν. — ὁ Χριστός does not mean the *doctrine* of Christ or concerning Christ,[1] nor does μανθάνειν τινά mean *to learn to know any one*, as it has usually in recent times been explained,[2] wherefore Raphel wrongly appeals to Xen. *Hellen.* ii. 1. 1 (ἵνα ἀλλήλους μάθοιεν ὁπόσοι εἴησαν, comp. Herod. vii. 208, where it means *to perceive*) ; but Christ is the great *collective object* of the instruction which the readers have received (Gal. i. 16 ; 1 Cor. i. 23 ; 2 Cor. i. 19 ; Phil. i. 15, *al.*), so that they have *learned* Christ. This special notion is required by the following εἴγε . . . ἐδιδάχθ.

Ver. 21. Εἴγε] *tum certe si*, "then assuredly if," as to which, however, there is no doubt (for Paul himself had preached to them Christ, and instructed them in Christ), introduces, as in iii. 2, in a delicate way the confirmation of the οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν : *assuming, at least, that ye have heard him and have received instruction in him, as it is truth in Jesus, that ye lay aside*, etc., that is : *if, namely, the preaching, in which ye became aware of Christ, and the instruction, which was imparted to you as Christians, have been in accordance with the fact that true fellowship with Christ consists in your laying aside*, etc. — αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε] to be explained after the analogy of the ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν, ver. 20 ; but αὐτόν, like ἐν αὐτῷ subsequently, is prefixed with emphasis. — ἐν αὐτῷ] is neither *ab eo*, "*by him*,"[3] nor *de eo*, "*from him*,"[4] nor "*per eum*," "*through him*,"[5] nor "*illius* nomine, quod ad illum attinet," "in his name, as to what concerns him" (Bengel) ; but it is to be explained from the conception ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι : *in Him*, in the fellowship of Christ, that is, *as Christians*. Observe the *progress* of the discourse, which passes over from the first proclamation of the gospel (αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε) to the further instruction which they have thereupon received *as already converted to Christ* (ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδαχθ.)—two elements, which were previously *comprehended* in ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν. — καθώς] in *the* manner *how*, introduces the *mode* of the having heard and having been instructed, so that this ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐδιδάχθητε καθὼς κ.τ.λ. corresponds to the previous οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν, affirmatively stating what οὐχ οὕτως had indicated negatively. — ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ] *Truth* it is in Jesus, that ye lay aside, etc., in so far as without this laying aside of your old man there would be no *true* but only an *apparent* fellowship with Jesus. [See Note XLVII., p. 486.] — ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ] Paul passes from the *official* name Χριστός to the *personal* name Ἰησοῦς, because he, after having previously recalled the preaching made to the Ephesians and instruction concerning *the Messiah*, now brings into prominence the *moral* character of this preaching and instruction, and the moral life of true Christianity is contained in believing fellowship with the historical *person* of the Messiah, with *Jesus*,[1] whose death has procured for believers their justification, and by virtue of their fellowship with Him the new life (Rom. vi. 2, 3), so that to be ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ with a retention of the old man, would be a *contradictio in adjecto*—would be untruth, and not ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ. We may add that this transition, unforced also at i 15, from Χριστός to Ἰησοῦς was not *necessary;* for, had Paul again written ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, there would therewith, as before, have been presented to the moral consciousness just the historical Christ *Jesus*. Comp. Gal. v. 24 ; Col. iii. 10 f. The accusative with the infinitive ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς depends on ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, so that it appears as subject of the sentence.[2] *Usually* ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς is made to depend on ἐδιδάχθητε, in which case καθώς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ is very differently explained. *Either* it is regarded as a parenthesis,[3] as by Rückert, who takes καθώς augmentatively, so that the sense is : "If ye are rightly instructed concerning Christ, ye have not so learned Him, for that would be false ; with Him (there where Christ is, lives and rules) there is, in fact, only truth (moral, religious truth) to be met with." *Or* καθώς ἐστιν κ.τ.λ. is attached to ἐδιδάχθητε, and then ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς is taken as epexegesis of καθώς ἐστιν κ.τ.λ., in which case ἀλήθεια in turn is differently explained.[4] *Or* the connection is so conceived of, that a οὕτως is supplied before ἀποθήσθαι, in which case Jesus appears as *model*.[5] So also Harless,[6] who, taking ἀλήθεια as *moral* truth (holiness), justifies ὑμᾶς from the comparison of Jesus with the readers ("as truth is in *Jesus*, so to lay aside *on your part*"), in which case Ἰησοῦ, not Χριστῷ, is held to be used, because the *man* Jesus is set forth as pattern. Matthies likewise makes ἀποϑέσϑαι depend on ἐδιδάχϑητε, but annexes καϑώς κ.τ.λ. as more precise definition to ἐν αὐτῷ : "*in Him, as or in as far as the truth is in Jesus*, as He is the truth." So Castalio appears already to have taken it. But all these explanations break down in presence of the ὑμᾶς, which, if ἀποϑέσϑαι ὑμᾶς belonged to ἐδιδάχϑητε, would be quite inappropriate. In particular, it may be further urged (*a*) in opposition to Rückert, that according to his explanation the parenthesis καϑώς ἐστιν ἀλήϑεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ must logically have had its place already after τὸν Χριστόν ; (*b*) in opposition to Harless, that the alleged comparison of Jesus with the readers is at variance with the order of the words, since Paul must have written : καϑὼς ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀλήϑειά ἐστιν, ὑμᾶς ἀποϑέσϑαι ; (*c*) in opposition to Matthies, that καϑὼς κ.τ.λ. does not stand beside ἐν αὐτῷ, and that ἀλήϑεια must have had the article. De Wette explains it to this effect : In Jesus there is (as inherent quality, comp. John viii. 44) truth (especially in a practical respect), consequently there is implied in the instructions concerning Him the principle and the necessity of moral change. But even thus we may expect, instead of ἀποϑ. ὑμᾶς, merely the simple ἀποϑέσϑαι. *Others* have attached ἀποϑέσϑαι ὑμᾶς to ver. 17, as continuation of the μηκέτι ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν κ.τ.λ.,[1] in which case καϑώς ἐστιν ἀλήϑ. ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ is likewise differently understood.[2] But after the new commencement of the discourse ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως, ver. 21, this is simply arbitrary and forced. Credner takes a peculiar view :[3] "Ye have not thus learned to know the Messiah, provided that ye (as I am warranted in presupposing, for it is only to such that I write) have heard *Him* and have been instructed in *Him, as He as truth* (truly, really) *is in Jesus*." Thus Paul is held to distinguish his readers from such Gentiles as, won over to faith in the near advent of the world's Redeemer, had reckoned themselves as Christians, but without believing in *Jesus* as that Redeemer. But of such *Gentiles* there is not found any trace in the N. T. (the disciples of John, Acts xix. 1 ff., are as such to be reckoned among the *Jews*) ; besides, there would lack any attachment for the following ἀποϑέσϑαι ὑμᾶς, and in using ἀλήϑεια (instead of ἐν ἀληϑ. or ἀληϑῶς) Paul would have expressed himself as enigmatically as possible. Lastly, Hofmann,[4] without reason, wishes to attach ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ not to καϑώς ἐστιν ἀλήϑ., but to what follows ; the in itself quite general καθώς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια stood in need of being characterized definitely as Christian, not the ἀποθέσθαι κ.τ.λ., as to which it was already implied in the nature of the case and was self-evident.

---

[1] So most expositors before Rückert ; but see Bengel and Flatt.

[2] By Rückert, Holzhausen, Meier, Matthies, Harless.

[3] Castalio, Gataker, Flatt.

[4] Piscator.

[5] Beza.

---

[1] Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 10 ff. : for "*Christi* ideam perfectissime et fulgidissime explevit *Jesus*," "Jesus has fulfilled most perfectly and most illustriously the ideal of Christ," Bengel.

[2] Kühner, II. p. 347 f.

[3] Beza, Er. Schmid, Michaelis.

[4] Camerarius, Raphel, Wolf : "edocti estis . . . quae sit vera disciplina Christi, nimirum ut deponatis," "ye have learned what is Christ's true discipline, viz., that ye lay aside." Comp. Piscator : "quaenam sit vera ratio vivendi in Jesu tanquam in capite . . . nempe deponere," "what is the true mode of living in Christ as a Head . . . viz., to lay aside." Grotius : "si ita edocti estis evangelium, quomodo illud revera se habet," "if ye have learned the Gospel as it truly is ;" so also Calixtus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Morus, and others.

[5] Jerome led the way with this explanation : "quomodo est veritas in Jesu, sic erit et in vobis qui didicistis Christum," "as the truth is in Jesus, so also will it be in you who have learned Christ." Subsequently it was followed by Erasmus, Estius ("sicut in Christo, Jesu nulla est ignorantia, nullus error, nihil injustum, sed pura veritas et justitia, sic et vos," "as in Christ Jesus, there is no ignorance, no error, nothing unjust, but pure truth and righteousness, so also ye," etc.), and others, including Storr, Flatt ("as He Himself is holy"), Holzhausen, Meier (ἀλήθεια is *Christian virtue*, "that ye, as truth in Jesus is, should lay aside").

[6] Followed by Olshausen.

Ver. 22. Ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς] dependent on καθώς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ. See on ver. 21. *What* is truth in Jesus, Paul states, not in general (*to lay aside*, etc.), but individualizingly *in relation to the readers ; that ye lay aside.*[5]

---

[1] Cornelius à Lapide Bengel, Zachariae ; not Wetstein, who at ver. 22 merely says "*respicit* comma 17," "he recurs to v. 17."

[2] Bengel : "ita uti veritas (vera agnitio Dei veri) reapse est in Jesu ; qui credunt in Jesum, verant," "as the truth (the true knowledge of God) is really in Jesus, let those who believe in Jesus speak the truth." Zachariae : "For in what Jesus teaches to us is alone to be found the truth by the heathen . . . despised." Both thus explain it, as if ἀλήϑ. had the article.

[3] *Einl.* II. p. 398 f.

[4] *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 291.

[5] Not : that *ye have* laid aside, as Hofmann wishes to take it, who explains as if Paul

Michaelis and Flatt give the strangely erroneous rendering : to lay aside *yourselves!* In that case there would be wanting the main matter, the reflexive *ἑαυτούς* ; and how alien to the N. T. such a form of conceiving self-denial ! Luther and others are also incorrect in rendering : *lay aside.* It is not till ver. 25 that the direct summons comes in, and that in the usual form of the *imperative*, instead of which the *infinitive*,[1] and with the *accusative ὑμᾶς* in addition,[2] would be inappropriate. The figurative expression of *laying aside* is borrowed from the *putting off clothing* (comp. *ἐνδύσασθαι*, ver. 24), and in current use, as with Paul (Rom. xiii. 12, 14 ; Col. iii. 8 ff. ; Gal. iii. 27), so also with Greek writers ;[3] hence there was the less reason for forcing on the context any more special reference, such as to the custom (at any rate, certainly later) of changing clothes at baptism.[4] — *κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφήν*] is not to be explained, as if the words stood : *τὸν παλ. ἄνθρ. τὸν κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστρ.*,[5] but : *that ye lay aside in respect of your former life-walk the old man*, so that it expresses, *in what respect, in reference to what* the laying aside of the old man is spoken of. "Declarat vim verbi relationem habentis *deponere*," "According to, shows the force of the word relating to it : '*Put off*,'" Bengel. The Pauline *παλ. ἄνθρ.*, *ideally* conceived of, is not injuriously affected, as de Wette thinks, in its internal truth by this recalling of the pre-Christian walk (as if the author had conceived of it *empirically*). The *προτέρα ἀναστρ.*, in fact, concerns the *whole* moral nature of man before his conversion, and the *ἀποθέσθαι τὸν παλ. ἄνθρ.* affirms that the converted man is to retain *nothing* of his pre-Christian moral personality, but, as concerns the pre-Christian conduct of life, is utterly to do away with the old ethical individuality and to become the new man. Such a contrast, however, as Cornelius à Lapide (comp. Anselm) found : "non quoad naturam et substantiam," "not as to nature and substance," would be in itself singular and foreign to the context. — As to *ἀναστροφή*, see on Gal. i. 13. — *τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρ.*] The pre-Christian moral frame[6] is represented as a person. See on Rom. vi. 6. [See Note XLVIII., p. 486 seq.] — *τὸν φθειρόμενον κ.τ.λ.*] an attribute of the old man serving as a motive for that *ἀποθέσθαι κ.τ.λ.* : *which is being destroyed according to the lusts of deception.* *φθειρόμενον* is not to be explained of *putrefaction*,[7] seeing that *ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρ.* is not equivalent to *τὸ σῶμα*, nor yet of *inward moral corruption*,[8] or *self-corruption*,[9] seeing that the moral corruption of the old man is obvious of itself and is

---

had written : *ἀποθεμένους ὑμᾶς . . . ἀνανεοῦσθαι τῷ πνεύματι . . . ἐνδυσαμένους κ.τ.λ.* Starting from the aorist infinitive thus taken at variance with linguistic usage (comp. on Rom. xv. 9 ; 2 Cor. vi. 1), Hofmann has incorrectly understood the whole passage. According to his interpretation, the *perfect* infinitive must have been used. The Vulgate already has correctly not *deposuisse*, but *deponere*.

[1] Winer, p. 282 f.

[2] Matthiae, p. 1267.

[3] See Wetstein, *in loc.*

[4] So Grotius.

[5] Jerome, Oecumenius, Vorstius, Grotius, Raphel, Estius, Semler, Koppe, Rosenmüller, and others.

[6] Not *original sin* (as Calovius and others would have it), which, in fact, cannot be laid aside, but the moral *habitus*, such as it is in the unregenerate man under the dominion of the sin-principle. Comp. Rom. vii. 7 ff. ; Eph. ii. 1 ff.

[7] Michaelis.

[8] Koppe, Flatt, Olshausen, Meier, Harless, and older expositors.

[9] Schenkel.

already present, not merely coming into existence (*present* participle, which is not to be taken, with Bengel, as *imperfect*), but of *eternal destruction* (Gal. vi. 8), in which case the *present* participle : *which goes to ruin* (comp. on 1 Cor. i. 18), is to be taken either of the certain *future* realized as present, or of the destruction *in the course of development*.[1] The latter appears more appropriate to the contrast of τὸν κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθέντα, ver. 24. — κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης] τῆς ἀπάτης is subjective genitive, and ἡ ἀπάτη is *personified*.[2] Hence : *in accordance with the lusts of deception*, with which it has had designs on the corruption of the old man." *What* ἀπάτη is meant, cannot be doubtful according to the context, and according to the doctrine of the apostle as to the principle of sin in man, namely, the *power of sin deceiving man* (Rom. vii. 11). Comp. Heb. iii. 13, also 2 Cor. xi. 3. The adjectival resolution into *cupiditates seducentes*, "seducing desires,"[3] followed by many, is in itself arbitrary and not in keeping with the contrast in ver. 24 (τῆς ἀληθείας).

Ver. 23. Positive side of that which is truth in Jesus : *that ye, on the other hand, become renewed in the spirit of your reason*. — ἀνανεοῦσθαι] *passive*, not *middle*,[4] since the middle has an *active* sense (1 Macc. xii. 1 ; Thuc. v. 18, 43 ; Polyb. vii. 3. 1, and often). The renewal is *God's* work through the Holy Spirit (Rom. viii. 1 f. ; Tit. iii. 5), and without it one is no true Christian (Rom. viii. 9 ; Gal. v. 15), consequently there can be no mention of ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ. Respecting the distinction between ἀνανεόω (only here in the N. T.) and ἀνακαινόω, *recentare* and *renovare*, as also respecting ἀνα, which does not refer to the restitution of human nature, as it was before the fall, but denotes the *recentare*, "to renew," in reference to the *previous* (corrupt) state, see on Col. iii. 10. — τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν] The genitive is at any rate that of the subject ; for instead of simply saying τῷ πνεύματι ὑμῶν,[5] Paul makes use of the more precise designation in the text. But the τῷ πνεύματι may be either *instrumental* or dative of *reference*. In the former case, however, we should[6] have to understand the *Holy Spirit*, who has His seat in the νοῦς of the man on whom He is bestowed, and *through whom* (dative), the ἀνακαίνωσις τοῦ νοός, "renewal of the mind," Rom. xii. 2, is effected, so that now the old ματαιοτης, "vanity," of the νοῦς, "mind" (iv. 17) no longer occurs, and the καινότης, "newness," which, on the other hand, has set in (Rom. vi. 4), is a καινότης τοῦ πνεύματος, "newness of spirit." Comp. Tit. iii. 5. But, in opposition to this view, we may urge, first, that the Holy Spirit bestowed on man is never in the N. T. designated in such a way that man appears as the subject of the Spirit (thus never : τὸ πνεῦμα ὑμῶν and the like, or as here : τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν) ; and secondly, that it was the object of the apostle to put forward the aspect of the moral self-activity of the Christian life, and hence he had no occasion expressly to introduce the point, which, moreover, was obvious of itself : *through the Holy Spirit.* Accordingly, there remains as the right explanation only the *usual* one (dative of reference), according to which the πνεῦμα is the *human* spirit, in distinction from the divine (Rom. viii. 16). Consequently : *in respect of the spirit of your* νοῦς, that is, of the spirit by which your νοῦς is governed. The πνεῦμα, namely, is the *higher life-principle* in man, the *moral power akin to God* in him, the seat of moral self-consciousness and of moral self-determination. This πνεῦμα, which forms the moral personality of man, the Ego of his higher ζωή turned towards God, has as the organ of its vital exercise—as the faculty of its moral operation—the νοῦς, that is, the reason in its ethical quality and activity (comp. on Rom. vii. 23), and puts the νοῦς [1] at the service of the divine will (Rom. vii. 25), in an assent to the moral practice of this divine will revealed in the law and a hatred of the contrary (Rom. vii. 14 ff.). But, since this Ego of the higher life, the substratum of the inward man—the πνεῦμα, in which the νοῦς has its support and its determining agent—is under the preponderant strength of the power of sin in the flesh non-free, bound, and weak, so that man under the fleshly-psychical influence of the natural character drawing him to sin becomes liable to the slavery of immoral habit, the πνεῦμα τοῦ νοός needed renewal unto moral freedom and might, which consecration of power it receives in regeneration by means of the Holy Spirit, in which case, however, even the regenerate has always to contend against the σάρξ still remaining in him, but contends victoriously under the guidance of the divine πνεῦμα (Gal. v. 16–18).

---

[1] So Grotius : "qui tendit ad exitium," "which tends to destruction."

[2] Comp. Hesiod. *Theog.* 224.

[3] Grotius.

[4] *Renew yourselves*, Luther.

[5] He might have written, as in Rom. xii. 2, merely τῷ νοΐ ὑμῶν ; but his conception here penetrates deeper, namely, to the fountainhead of the vital activity of the νοῦς, to the inner agent and mover in that activity.

[6] With Oecumenius, Castalio, and others, including Ch. F. Fritzsche in his *Nov. Opusc.* p. 244 f., and Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 28.

Ver. 24. Observe *the change of tenses.* The *laying aside of the old man* is the negative commencement of the change, and hence is represented as a *momentary* act ; the *becoming renewed* is an *enduring* process, the *finishing act* of which is the *putting on of the new man*, correlative to the ἀποθέσθαι. Hence ἀποθέσθαι, *aorist ;* ἀνανεοῦσθαι, *present ;* ἐνδύσασθαι, *aorist.* — τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον] As previously the old immoral state is objectivized, and objectivized indeed as a person, so is it also here with the new Christian moral state. Thus this new *habitus* appears as *the new man*, which God has created (κτισθέντα), but man appropriates for himself (ἐνδύσασθαι), so that thus moral freedom is not annulled by God's ethical creative action. — κτισθέντα] not *present*, but the new moral *habitus* of the Christian is set forth as the person created by God, which in the individual cases *is* not first *constituted by growth*, but is *received*, and then exhibits itself experimentally in the case of those who, according to the figurative expression of the passage, have *put it on.* — κατὰ Θεόν] Comp. Col. iii. 10 ; not merely *divinely*, and that in contrast to human propagation,[2] but : *according to God*, i.e., *ad exemplum Dei*, "according to the model of God" (Gal. iv. 28). Thereby the creation of the new man is placed upon a parallel with that of our first parents (Gen. i. 27), who were created after God's image (*κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος*, Col. iii. 10); they, too, until through Adam sin came into existence, were as sinless *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας.*[1] — *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ κ.τ.λ.*] belongs to *τὸν κατὰ Θεόν κτισθέντα*, expressing the *constitution* of the new man created after God; *furnished, provided with rectitude and holiness of the truth.*[2] The *truth* is the opposite of the *ἀπάτη*, ver. 22, and like this personified. As in the old man the *'Απάτη* pursues its work, so in the new man the *'Αλήθεια*, *i.e.*, the Truth *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, "pre-eminently," the divine *evangelical* truth, bears sway, and the moral *effects* of the truth, righteousness and holiness, appear here, where the truth is personified, as its *attributes*, which now *show themselves* in the new man who has been created. The resolving it into an *adjective: true*, not merely apparent, righteousness and holiness,[3] is arbitrary and tame. And to take *ἐν instrumentally*[4] is erroneous, for the reason that righteousness and holiness form the ethical *result* of the creation of the new man; hence Beza, Koppe, and others thought that *ἐν* must be taken for *εἰς*. *δικαιοσύνη* and *ὁσιότης* (comp. Luke i. 75; 1 Thess. ii. 10; Tit. i. 8) are distinguished so, that the latter places rectitude in itself (*δικαιοσύνη*), *in relation to God* (*sanctitas*, "holiness"); *τὸ μὲν τοῖς θεοῖς προσφιλὲς ὅσιον*, "what is pleasing to the gods is holy," Plat. *Euth.* p. 6 E.[5] With special frequency the two notions are associated in Plato.

---

[1] Bengel excellently puts it : "*Spiritu mens*, 'In the spirit of the mind ;' 1 Cor. xiv. 14, *Spiritus est intimum mentis*, 'The spirit is the inmost shrine of the mind'" Delitzsch consequently errs (*Psychol.* p. 184) in thinking that expositors have here *neglected* to seek instruction from 1 Cor. xiv 14.

[2] Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 289.

Ver. 25. On the ground of what was previously said (*διό*), as application of *ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ 'Ιησοῦ ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.* on to ver. 24, there now follow various special (not systematically arranged) exhortations as far as ver. 32. — That the encouragement *to lay aside lying and to speak the truth* stands at the head, appears to be occasioned simply by the last uttered *τῆς ἀληθεῖας*; and the *figurative form* of the precept (*ἀποθέμενοι*) is an echo from what precedes. It is possible also, however, that the prohibitions of lying, wrath, stealing, as they are here given, had their concrete occasion with which we are not acquainted. The reasons which Zanchius, *e.g.*, has discovered, are arbitrary. And Grotius says incorrectly: "Hoc adversus eos dicit, qui, ut gratias capatarent aut Judaeorum aut gentium, alia dicebant, quam sentirent," "This he says against those who, to obtain the favor of either Jews or Gentiles, said other things than they thought." The subsequent *ὅτι ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλ. μέλη* shows, in fact, that Paul has thought merely of the relation of fellowship of Christians *one with another*, and has meant *μετὰ τοῦ πλησίου αὐτοῦ* of the *fellow-Christian*, not of the *fellow-man* generally.[6] — *λαλεῖτε . . . αὐτοῦ* is a reminiscence from Zech. viii. 16. — *ὅτι ἐσμὲν κ.τ.λ.*] *Motive* (reminding them of vv. 12–16). *Members* one of another, and *to lie* one to another, how contradictory! Reciprocal membership is, in fact, a connection so intimate and vital, subsisting in constant mutual furtherance and rendering of service! "est enim monstrum, si membra inter se non consentiant, imo si fraudulenter inter se agant," "for there is a monster if the members do not harmonize with one another, but act towards each other deceitfully," Calvin. Chrysostom shows at great length how the several members of the real body do not deceive one another, and Michaelis repeats it; but Paul says nothing of this. — *ἀλλήλ. μέλη*] *members of each other*, mutually the one of the other. The same conception is met with Rom. xii. 5, and is not *inaccurate*,[1] since, indeed, in the body of Christ, even as in the physical body, no member exists for itself, but each belonging to each, in mutual union with the other members, 1 Cor. xii. 15 ff.

---

[1] Comp. Ernesti, *Ursprung der Sünde*, II. p. 135 ff., in opposition to Julius Müller, II. p. 487, who calls in question the identity of contents between the *κατὰ θεόν* and the original divine image.

[2] On *ἐν*, see Matthiae, p. 1340.

[3] Chrysostom, Luther, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, and most expositors.

[4] Morus, Flatt.

[5] See Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 25, and the passages in Wetstein.

[6] Jerome, Estius, Grotius, Michaelis, and others.

Vv. 26, 27. See Zyro in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1841, p. 681 ff. — *ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε*] a precept expressed literally after the LXX. Ps. iv. 5, as to which it must be left undetermined whether Paul understood the original text[2] as the LXX. did, or chose this form only in recollection of the LXX., *without* attending to the original text. To the right understanding of the sense (which Paul would have expressed by *ὀργιζόμενοι μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε*, or something similar, if that definite form of expression in the LXX. had not presented itself to him) the observation of Bengel guides us: "Saepe vis modi cadit super partem duntaxat sermonis, 'Often the force of the mode falls on only a part of the remark,' Jer. x. 24."[3] Here, namely, the *vis modi*, "force of the mode," lies upon the second imperative (comp. passages like John. i. 47, vii. 52): be angry *and sin not*, *i.e.*, *in anger do not fall into transgression*; so that Paul forbids the *combination* of the *ἁμαρτάνειν* with the *ὀργίζεσθαι*. Comp. Matthies: "In the being angry let it not come to sin;" Harless: "Be angry in the right way, without your sinning."[4] Paul, therefore, does not forbid the *ὀργίζεσθαι* in itself, and could not forbid it, because there is[5] a *holy* anger,[6] which is "*calcar virtutis*," "a spur to virtue,"[7] as there is also a *divine* anger; the *ὀργίζεσθαι καὶ ἁμαρτάνειν*, however, is not to take place, but, on the contrary, the *ὀργίζεσθαι* is to be *without* sin, consequently an *ὀργίζεσθαι καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνειν*. As regards the substantial sense, the same result is brought out with the *usual* explanation, but it is usually believed[8] that the imperative may be resolved *conditionaliter*, "conditionally," in accordance with Hebrew usage: *if ye are angry*, *do not sin* (Isa. viii. 9 f.; Amos v. 4, 6, *al.*).[9] But the combination of the two imperatives connected by *and*, like: *do this, and live*, Gen. xii. 18, comp. Isa. viii. 9, and similar passages, —a combination, moreover, which is not a Hebraism, but a general idiom of language (comp. *divide et impera*),—is not at all in point here, because it would lead to the in this case absurd analysis: "if ye are angry, ye shall not sin." Winer, p. 279, allows the taking of the first imperative in a *permissive* sense.[1] In this way we should obtain as result: "*be angry* (I cannot hinder it), *but only do not sin.*" So also de Wette. No doubt a permission of anger, because subsequently *καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτ.* follows, would not be in conflict with ver. 31, where manifestly all *hostile* anger is forbidden; but the mere *καί* is only logically correct when both imperatives are thought of in the *same* sense, not the former as permitting and the latter as enjoining, in which case the combination becomes *exceptive* ("only, however"), which would be expressed by *ἀλλά*, *πλήν*, or *μόνον*.[2] Beza, Piscator, Grotius, and others take *ὀργίζ.* *interrogatively*: "*irascimini, et ne peccate*," "Are you angry? do not sin." Against this we cannot urge—the objection usually taken since the time of Wolf—the *καί*, which often in rapid emotion strikes in with some summons;[3] but we may urge the fact that Paul *reproduces a passage of the LXX.*[4] in which *ὀργίζ.* is *imperative*, and that such an abrupt and impassioned question and answer would not be in keeping with the whole calm and sober tone of the discourse. — *μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε*] forbids *every kind* of sinning, to which anger may lead. Zyro, after Neander, would limit it to the hostile relation towards *others*, which, however, is purely a supplied thought (*εἰς τὸν πλησίον*, or the like). — *ὁ ἥλιος . . . διαβόλῳ*] not included as belonging to the words of the Psalm, states *in what way* the given precept is to be carried out; namely, (1) the irritation must be laid aside on the same day, and (2) no scope may therein be given to the devil. — *ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω κ.τ.λ.*] Comp. Deut. xxiv. 13, 15; Jer. xv. 9; Philo, *de Legg. Spec.* II. p. 324.[5] The *ἐπιδυέτω* is to be taken: go *down* over your irritation.[6] That the night is here conceived of as the *nurse* of wrath,[7] or that the eventide of *prayer* is thought of,[8] is arbitrarily assumed. Jerome and Augustine interpreted it even of *Christ*, the Sun of Righteousness, and Lombard of the sun of *reason!* The meaning of these words, to be taken quite literally,[9] is no other than: *before evening let your irritation be over*, by which the *very speedy*, *undelayed* abandoning of anger is concretely represented. — παροργισμός is the *arousing of wrath*, *exacerbatio*, from which ὀργή, as a lasting mood, is different. Comp. LXX. 1 Kings xv. 30, *al.* In the Greek writers the word does not occur. We may add that Zanchius and Holzhausen are mistaken in holding the παρά in the word to indicate *unrighteous* irritation. See, on the other hand, *e.g.*, Rom. x. 19 ; Ezek. xxxii. 9. It denotes the excitement *brought upon us*. [See Note XLIX., p. 487.]— μηδέ] *nor yet*, for the annexation of a new clause falling to be added.[1] The *Recepta* μήτε would so place the two prohibitions side by side, that they ought properly to be connected by *neither . . . nor* (μήτε . . . μήτε), but that Paul had not yet thought of this in the first clause, but had written the simple μή, and had only at the second clause changed the conception into such a form as if he had previously written μήτε (comp. our : *not . . . nor*). This usage is met with (in opposition to Elmsley) also in classical writers, although more rarely,[2] but not elsewhere in Paul, and hence is not probable here. — δίδοτε τόπον] *i.e.*, give scope, *opportunity for being active.* See on Rom. xii. 19. — τῷ διαβόλῳ] *to the devil ;* for *he* is denoted by διάβολος in *all* passages of the N. T., where it is not an adjective (1 Tim. iii. 11, 12 ; 2 Tim. iii. 3 ; Tit. ii. 3), even in 1 Tim. iii. 6 ; John vi. 70. Hence Erasmus,[3] Luther, Erasmus Schmid, Michaelis, Zachariae, Morus, Stolz, Flatt, and others [4] are in error in holding that διάβολος is here equivalent to *calumniator ;* in which view Erasmus thought of the *heathen* slandering the Christians, to whom they were to furnish no material ; and most expositors thought of the *tale-bearers* nursing disputes, to whom they were not to lend an ear. In an irritated frame of mind passion easily gains the ascendency over sobriety and watchfulness, and *that* physical condition is favorable to the *devil* for his work of seducing into everything that is opposed to God. Comp. 1 Pet. v. 8 ; 2 Cor. ii. 11 ; Eph. vi. 11 ff. Harless refers the danger on the part of the devil to the corruption of the *church-life*,[5] the fellowship of which, in the absence of placability, is rent by the devil. But this, as not implied in the context, must have been *said* by an addition (ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, or the like, after τόπον).— The name διάβολος does not occur elsewhere in the undoubtedly genuine Epistles of the apostle ; but this, considering the equally general currency of the two names devil and Satan, may be accidental. Comp. also Acts xiii. 10. We may add that the citation of the Clementines (*Hom.* xix. 2) : μὴ δότε πρόφασιν τῷ πονηρῷ, " Give no pretext to the evil one," has nothing to do with our passage.[6]

---

[1] Rückert.

[2] The words of the original, רִגְזוּ וְאַל־תֶּחֱטָאוּ, mean: *tremble, and err not* (Ewald), with which David calls upon his enemies to tremble on account of their iniquities towards him, the favorite of God, and not further to sin. Comp. also Hupfeld *in loc.* Yet other recent scholars, including Hitzig, have translated, in harmony with the LXX.: *Be angry, but offend not.*

[3] Comp. also Isa. xii. 1; Matt. xi. 25; and see Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 249 f. [E. T. 290].

[4] When, however, Harless would assign to our passage a place "not under the head of anger, but under that of placability," he overlooks the fact that in anger one may commit sin otherwise than by implacability; and that the following ὁ ἥλιος κ.τ.λ. brings into prominence only a *single* precept *falling under* the μὴ ἁμαρτ.

[5] See Wuttke, *Sittenl.* II. § 243.

[6] That this, however, is not meant in ver. 31, see on that verse.

[7] Seneca, *de ira*, iii. 3.

[8] And already in the *Constitutt. Apost.* ii. 53, 2, the passage of the Psalm is so taken.

[9] So also Koppe, Flatt, Rückert, Holzhausen, Meier, Olshausen, Zyro, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek.

---

[1] Comp. Krüger, § 54, 4. 2.

[2] This is no "philological theorizing," but is based on logical necessity. No instance can be adduced in which, of two imperatives coupled by *καί*, the former is to be taken as concessive and the second as preceptive, in contrast to the former. To refer to Jer. x. 24 as a parallel, as Winer does, is erroneous, for the very reason that in that passage—which, however, in general is very different from ours—*πλήν*, not *καί*, is used.

[3] Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 148.

[4] Which, it is true, is quite arbitrarily denied by Beza and Koppe.

[5] On the citation of these words in Polyc. *Phil.* 12, see Introd. § 3.

[6] Comp. also Hom. *Il.* ii. 413, and Faesi, *in loc.* (Nägelsbach *in loc.* takes another view).

[7] Fathers in Suicer, I. p. 1323; Bengel, and others.

[8] Baumgarten.

[9] Comp. the custom of the Pythagoreans: εἴποτε προαχθεῖεν εἰς λοιδορίας ὑπ᾽ ὀργῆς, πρὶν ἢ τὸν ἥλιον δύναι τὰς δεξιὰς ἐμβάλλοντες ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι διελύοντο, "If they were ever led by wrath to abuse, taking each other's hands and embracing, they were reconciled before the sun went down," Plut. *de am. frat.* p. 488 B.

Ver. 28. *The stealer is no more to steal.* The *present* participle does not stand *pro praeterito*, "for the *past*,"[7] but : *he who occupies himself with stealing.* The right view is already taken by Zanchius ; see also Winer, p. 316. As there were in the apostolic church *fornicators* (1 Cor. v. 1), so there were also *stealers*,[8] and the attempts to tone down the notion are just as arbitrary as they are superfluous.[1] The question why Paul does not mention *restitution* (Luke xix. 8; Ex. xxii.; Lev. vi.; Isa. lviii. 6; Ezek. xxxiii. 15; Plato, *Legg.* ix. p. 864 D f.) is not, with Estius, to be answered to the effect, that it is contained in *μηκέτι κλεπτέτω*;[2] but to the effect, that Paul's design was not to give any complete instruction on the point of stealing, but only to inculcate the prohibition of the same and the obligation of the opposite (which, moreover, has restitution for its self-evident moral presupposition). The whole exhortation in this form has, indeed, been regarded as inappropriate, because not in keeping with the apostolic strictness;[3] but we have to observe, on the other hand, that Paul elsewhere too contents himself with simple prohibitions and commands (see *e.g.* Rom. xiii. 13 f.), and that the apostolic strictness follows in the sequel (v. 5). — *μᾶλλον δέ*] *rather on the other hand, imo vero*, enhancing in a corrective sense the merely negative *μηκέτι κλεπτ.* See on Gal. iv. 9. — *κοπίατω κ.τ.λ.*] *let him labor, in that he works with his hands that which is good*; in that, by the activity of his hands (instead of his thievish practices), he brings about that which belongs to the category of the morally good. Bengel well says: "*τὸ ἀγαθόν* antitheton ad furtum prius manu piceata male commissum," "is the contrast to the theft first committed with thievish hand." — *ἵνα ἔχῃ κ.τ.λ.*] The view of Schoettgen, that this applies to the Jewish opinion of the allowableness of theft serving for the support of the poor,[4] is indeed repeated by Koppe (comp. Stolz) and Holzhausen, but is—considering the general nature of the *ὁ κλέπτ. μηκέτι κλεπτ.*, addressed, moreover, to readers mostly Gentile-Christian—not expressed in the words, which rather quite simply oppose to the forbidden *taking* the *giving* according to duty. — *τῷ χρείαν ἔχοντι*] *to the one having need*, namely, that there may be imparted to him. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 24; Mark ii. 25; 1 John iii. 17; Plat. *Legg.* vi. p. 783 C, xii. p. 965 B.

---

[1] See Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 210.

[2] See Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 709 ; Bornemann, *ad Xen. Anab.* iv. 8. 3, p. 303, Lips. ; Maetzn. *ad Antiph.* p. 195 f.

[3] Not in the *Paraphr.*

[4] Koppe is undecided.

[5] Comp. Erasmus, *Paraphr.*

[6] In opposition to Schwegler, *l.c.*, p. 393 f.

[7] Luther, Erasmus, Grotius, and most of the older expositors, following the Vulgate.

[8] In connection with which the appeal to

Ver. 29. After the three definite exhortations, vv. 25, 26, 28, now follow more general and comprehensive ones. — *Πᾶς λόγος . . . μὴ ἐκπορ.*] The negation is not to be separated from the verb. With regard to every evil discourse, it is enjoined that it shall not go forth, etc.[5] — *σαπρός*] *corrupt*; in the ethical sense: *worthless* (*ὃ μὴ τὴν ἰδίαν χρείαν πληροῖ*, "which does not satisfy its appropriate use," Chrysostom), *pravus*, "distorted;" opposite: *ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας*.[6] — *ἀλλ' εἴ τις ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκ. τ. χρ.*] *but if there*

---

the *permission* of stealing among various heathen nations, as among the Egyptians and Lacedaemonians (see Wolf, *Cur.*; Müller, *Dorier*, II. p. 310 f.), is entirely unsuitable in an apostolic epistle with its high moral earnestness. Against such a prejudice Paul would have written otherwise.

[1] See, *e.g.*, Jerome: "furtum nominans omne, *quod alterius damno quaeritur*," naming as theft everything sought with injury to another." He approves, moreover the interpreting it of the *furtum spirituale*, "spiritual theft," of the false prophets. Estius: "generaliter positum videtur pro, *fraudare, subtrahere*, etc., "It seems to be put generally for 'to defraud, withdraw,' etc." Comp. Calvin and many, as also still Holzhausen.

[2] "*Nam qui non restituit cum possit, is adhue in furto . . . perseverat*," "for he who does not restore when he can, is still persevering in theft." This is in itself true, but no reader could light upon such a pregnant meaning of the *μηκέτι κλεπτέτω*.

[3] See de Wette.

[4] *Jalk. Rubeni*, f. 110, 4; *Vajikra rabba*, f. 147, 1.

[5] See Fritzsche, *Diss. II. in 2 Cor.* p. 24 ff.

[6] See, in general, Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 377 f.; Kypke, II. p. 297 f.

is any (discourse) *good for the edification of the need*, *sc.*, let it proceed from your mouth. On ἀγαθός with εἰς, πρός,[1] or infinitive, denoting aptitude or serviceableness for anything, see Kypke, II. p. 298. — *πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας* does not stand by hypallage for εἰς χρείαν τῆς οἰκοδομῆς,[2] but τῆς χρείας is an objective genitive; it is *the need just present*, upon which the edifying (Christianly helpful) influence of the discourse is to act. Rückert and Olshausen take ἡ χρεία for οἱ χρείαν ἔχοντες. Arbitrarily and to the disturbance of the sense, since in fact *every one* has need of edification, consequently τῆς χρείας would convey nothing at all characteristic, no *modal* definition of ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομ. — *ἵνα δῷ χάριν τοῖς ἀκούουσι*] aim of the ἐκπορ. ἐκ τ. στ. ὑμ., previously conceived as supplied : *in order that it* (this discourse) *may bestow grace*, *i.e.*, benefit, *on the hearers*, may bring blessing for them. Opposite of such discourses : 2 Tim. ii. 14. Theodoret (ἵνα φανῇ δεκτὸς τοῖς ἀκ., "that it may appear acceptable to the hearers, etc."), Luther, Calovius, Raphel, Kypke, Zachariae, Michaelis, Koppe, Rosenmüller, and others, including Rückert, Meier, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius : in order that it may *afford pleasure*, *be agreeable*, to the hearers. Comp. also Chrysostom, who compares the discourse to a fragrant ointment. But, apart from the fact that discourses, which are good πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας, *cannot* always be agreeable (1 Cor. vii. 8 ff.), this interpretation is opposed to linguistic usage, according to which χάριν δίδωμι always signifies *gratificari*, *to confer a kindness*, to show a service of love, or the like (Jas. iv. 6 ; 1 Pet. v. 5 ; Ex. iii. 21 ; Ps. lxxxiv. 12 [11] ; Tob. i. 13 ; Soph. *Aj.* 1333 ; Plat. *Legg.* iii. p. 702 C ; also in the passages adduced by Wetstein and Kypke).

Ver. 30. Connected by καί with what precedes ; hence not, with Lachmann and Tischendorf, to be separated by a full stop from ver. 29, by which there would result an exhortation too *indefinite* in the connection. — *And grieve not* (which would take place by means of λόγοι σαπροί) *the Holy Spirit of God.* Evil discourses are so opposed to the holy nature and aim of the Divine Spirit, who dwells in the Christians, that He cannot fail to be grieved thereat.[3] An anthropopathic conception of the consciousness, with which the Spirit of God is holily affected, of the incongruity of human action with His holiness ; but how truly and touchingly in keeping with the idea of the *love* of God, which bears sway in His Spirit (Rom. v. 5) ! *The man* becomes conscious of this grieving of the divine πνεῦμα, when he, who has become through the atonement and sanctification the dwelling-place of the Spirit, no longer receives from this Spirit the testimony that he is the child of God (Rom. viii. 16). The chosen expression, "*the Holy Spirit of God*," renders the *enormity* of such action most palpable. An allusion, we may add, to Isa. lxiii. 10 is not to be assumed, since in that passage the παροξύνειν [exasperating] of the Spirit is characteristic. — *ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγ. εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρ.*] *furnishes motive* for the exhortation : for if ye have received so great a benefit through the Holy Spirit, how wrong (ungrateful) is it when you grieve Him ! Harless, following older expositors, finds the *possibility of losing* the seal here hinted at. But to this μὴ λυπεῖτε points less naturally than μὴ παροξύνετε (Isa. lxiii. 10) would point to it. — ἐσφραγ.] quite as at i. 13. — εἰς ἡμέρ. ἀπολυτρ.] *for the day of redemption ;* when at the Parousia the *certainty* of the deliverance unto salvation, indicated by ἐσφραγ., becomes *reality*. As to ἀπολύτρωσις, comp. on i. 14 ; Luke xxi. 28 ; also Rom. viii. 23.

---

[1] Plat. *Rep.* vii. p. 522 A, and Stallbaum *in loc.*

[2] Beza.

[3] Comp. *Hermas*, ii. 10. 3, as also ii. 3 : μὴ θλῖβε τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον τὸ ἐν σοὶ κατοικοῦν, μήποτε ἐντεύξηται τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἀποστῇ ἀπὸ σοῦ, "Distress not the Holy Spirit that dwelleth in you, lest he entreat God, and he depart from you."

Vv. 31, 32. Πικρία] *Bitterness, i.e.*, fretting spitefulness, Acts viii. 23 ; Jas. iii. 14.[1] — As to the distinction between θυμός (*ebullition of anger*) and ὀργή, see on Rom. ii. 8 ; Gal. v. 20. The context shows, we may add, that here *loveless and hostile* anger is meant : hence there is no inconsistency with ver. 26. — κραυγή] *clamor*, in which hostile passion breaks out, Acts xxiii. 9.[2] — βλασφημία] not : " verba, quae *Dei* honorem . . . laedunt," " words that injure God's honor," Grotius ; but, in accordance with the context, evil-speaking *against the brethren*, comp. Col. iii. 8 ; 1 Tim. vi. 4 ; Matt. xii. 31, xv. 19. —κακία] is here not *badness in general, vitiositas*,[3] but, in harmony with the connection, the special *spite, malice*, Rom. i. 29 ; Col. iii. 8. This is the leaven of the πικρία κ.τ.λ. — γίνεσθε] not *be*, but *become*, in keeping with the ἀρθήτω ἀφ' ὑμῶν. — χρηστοί] *kind*, Col. iii. 12.[4] The conjecture that the word contains an allusion to the name *Christians*,[5] is an arbitrary fancy. — εὔσπλαγχνοι] *compassionate*. Comp. Manass. 6 ; 1 Pet. iii. 8, and the passages from the *Test. XII. Patr.* in Kypke. — χαριζόμενοι] *forgiving*, 2 Cor. ii. 7, 10, xii. 13. The explanation *donantes* [donating] (Vulgate), *largientes* [giving bountifully] (Erasmus), is not in keeping with the context. — ἑαυτοῖς] equivalent to ἀλλήλοις. See on Col. iii. 12. — καθὼς καὶ ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.] Motive to the χαριζ. ἑαυτ., from their own experience of the archetypal conduct of God. Matt. vi. 14, xviii. 21 ff. — ἐν Χριστῷ] *in Christ*, in whose self-surrender to the death of atonement the act of the divine forgiveness was accomplished, i. 6 f. ; 2 Cor. v. 19.

Notes by American Editor.

XXXVI. Ver. 2. μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης κ.τ.λ.

" The very work for which Christ's gospel came into the world was no other than to cast down the mighty from their seat, and to exalt the humble and meek ; it was then only in accordance with this its task and mission that it should dethrone the heathen virtue μεγαλοψυχία, and set up the despised ταπεινοφροσύνη in its room. . . Indeed, the very word ταπεινοφροσύνη is, I believe, itself a birth of the gospel ; I am not aware of any Greek writer who employed it before the Christian era, or apart from the influence of Christian writings after . . . The use which heathen writers make of

---

[1] See Wetstein, *ad Rom.* iii. 14 ; Loesner, *Obss.* p. 344 f. ; Wyttenbach, *ad Plut. Mor.* VI. p 1033.

[2] Chrysostom calls the κραυγή the steed of anger.

[3] Cic. *Tusc.* iv. 15. 34.

[4] See Tittmann, *Synon.* pp. 140, 195.

[5] Olshausen.

ταπεινός, ταπεινότης, and other words of this family, shows plainly in what sense they would have employed *ταπεινοφροσύνη*, had they thought it good to allow the word. For indeed the instances in which *ταπεινός* is used in any other than an evil sense, and to signify aught else than that which is low, slavish and mean-spirited, are few and altogether exceptional." (Trench, Synonyms of the N. T., First Series, p. 201). As to its relation to *πραότης*: "The gospel of Christ did not to so great an extent rehabilitate *πραότης* . . . *Πραότης* did not require to be turned from a bad sense to a good, but only to be lifted up from a lower good to a higher." Aristotle "finds the *πραότης* worthy of praise, more because by it a man retains his own equanimity and composure, than from any nobler reason." But "the scriptural *πραότης* is not in man's outward behavior only; nor yet in his relations to his fellow-men; as little in his mere outward disposition. Rather it is an unwrought grace of the soul, and the exercises of it are first and chiefly towards God (Matt. xi. 29; James i. 21). It expresses that temper of spirit in which we accept His dealings with us without disputing and resisting; and it is closely linked with the *ταπεινοφροσύνη*, and follows close upon it (Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12), because it is only the humble heart which is also the meek; and which as such does not fight against God, and more or less struggle and contend with Him."

XXXVII. Ver. 5. *μία πίστις.*

Meyer's position is confirmed by Harless, who denies absolutely the application of *fides quae creditur* to *πίστις* in Scripture. Nevertheless, the qualification of Ellicott should not be overlooked: "That this, however, must not be unduly limited to the feeling of the individual, *e.g.*, to faith in its utterly *subjective* aspect, seems clear from the use of *μία* and the general context. As there is one Lord, so the *μία πίστις* is not only a subjective recognition of this eternal truth, but also necessarily involves a common objective profession.

XXXVIII. Ver. 5. *Omission of the Lord's Supper.*

Eadie, Ellicott, Alford, Braune agree in the explanation as given by the last: "The Lord's Supper is rather an act of the preserved unity than a motive for its preservation. It is celebrated by those who have been reconciled with God and hold each other to be brethren; it does not so much give an impulse to peaceableness, as it is a result of the same, as a common celebration of those who have been united together, as an attestation of the church which has become one in the Lord." Alford adds: "In 1 Cor. x. 17, where an act was in question which was a clear breach of union, it forms the rallying-point."

XXXIX. Ver. 8. *ἔδωκε δόματα.*

The idea of *ἔδωκε* cannot be justified from the letter of Ps. lxviii. 18. The form of the quotation would be unallowable in an uninspired writer. But by illumination of the Holy Spirit, the apostle discerns the true idea involved in Christ's reception of gifts, and employs a word which will the more fully and clearly express the mind of the Spirit in the Psalm. "We cannot argue from the meaning of the word, but we may from the scope of the passage. The truth is, that the apostle sees in the literal O. T. a higher spiritual significance . . . The apostle sees that when a king takes, he takes to give, and therefore substitutes the one word for the other, without at all putting the one word as the *translation* of the other." (Perowne on Ps. lxviii. 19). "We admit then frankly and freely the verbal difference, but remembering that the apostle wrote under inspiration of the Holy Ghost, we recognize here neither imperfect memory, precipitation (Rück.), arbitrary change (Calv.), accommodation (Morus), nor Rabbinical interpretation (Meyer), but simply the *fact* that the psalm, and especially ver. 18, *had* a Messianic reference, and bore within it a further, fuller and deeper meaning. This meaning the inspired apostle, by a slight change of language and the substitution of "*gave*" for the more dubious "*received*," succinctly, suggestively and *authoritatively* unfolds" (Ellicott).

XL. Ver. 8. ἠχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν κ.τ.λ.

The τοῖς ἀνθρώποις in the succeeding clause must not be pressed too far on either side in the interpretation of the αἰχμαλωσίαν. The former might readily be included under the latter, the reference being to the same object only with a changed relation, as Harless, Olshausen and Braune evidently regard it. On the other hand, the αἰχμαλωσίαν probably includes everything arrayed against Christ's power, "sin, death and conscience," Luther, Er. ed. 64 : 240 ; or "Satan and the gates of hell," Calovius, or, with the great body of interpreters, "Satan, sin and death," which, against their will, are converted into means for advancing the salvation of men. Thus a continual repetition of what is stated in Heb. ii. 14 is occurring. Yet what occurs thus with these forces of the evil world is also fulfilled in another manner with converted men. They become "gifts" to their fellow-men in the church by first having been led willing captives by the great conqueror. This is the history of all the "apostles," "prophets," "evangelists," etc., enumerated in ver. 11, as the church's "gifts."

XLI. Ver. 9. εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη.

"The greater the descent, the greater the ascent ; and if the αἰχμαλωσία consisted of Satan and his powers, the warfare in which they were taken captive would most naturally be contemplated in all its extent, as reaching to their habitation itself : 'This ascent, what does it imply but a descent, and that even to the lower parts of the earth, from which the spoils of victory were fetched. This meaning seems to be upheld by the τά πάντα which follows, as well as by the contrast'" (Alford). So among English writers, Ellicott and Barry. Dr. Riddle suggests that this view may have been maintained from the desire to sustain the article of the Creed : "He descended into hell," while "the other may have been quite as much influenced by the fear of favoring the Romish appendages." Eadie has an analysis of the various views, and a long defence of the expression as referring to the earth. Braune correctly rejects with Meyer Chrysostom's interpretation, which applies it to Christ's burial. Philippi (Kirch. Glaubens. iv. 1, 171) refers it to the Incarnation.

XLII. Ver. 10. ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα.

Luther : "That in all things he might work all, and without Him nothing be done, thought, or spoken" (Randglossen, Erl. ed. lxiv. 241).

XLIII. Ver. 13. *τῆς επιγνώσεως.*

"Clear and exact knowledge" (Cremer). See Note XIII., chap. i. 17: "Christians are not to be, as in times past, some fully informed in one section of truth, but erring through defective information on other points concerning the Saviour—some with a superior knowledge of the merits of His death, and others with a quicker perception of the beauties of His life . . . but they are to be characterized by the completeness and harmony of their ideas of the power, the work, the history, the love, and the glory of the Son of God" (Eadie).

XLIV. Ver. 13. *εἰς μέτρον κ.τ.λ.*

ἡλικία has rarely in classical Greek the meaning of "stature," but often used of "the flower or prime of life, *i.e.*, from 17 to 45," and of women, "marriageable age" (Liddell and Scott).

XLV. Ver. 16. *διά πάσης ἀφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας.*

The use of *ἁφῆς* for joint is found in Aristotle, whose terminology is decisive as to the propriety of the application. Col ii. 19 seems to clearly settle the fact that it must have such meaning here. So Eadie, Ellicott, Alford, Riddle.

XLVI. Ver. 18. *διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν κ.τ.λ.*

Neither Tischendorf nor Westcott and Hort approve of the deletion of the commas, which Meyer finds necessary for his interpretation. There is nothing difficult in tracing their *habitual* ignorance to repeated acts whereby the light of the truth was excluded. An effort to be ignorant results in a state of complete darkening of understanding. Neither is this in any way inconsistent with the doctrine of original sin. The earlier condition of the heathen was one in which they were more susceptible to the movements of divine grace. "For this two-fold condition" (*i.e.*, of darkening and alienation), "the apostle gives a two-fold ground, whose members mutually condition each other, because they are attached to one and the same subject. . . . The condition of their darkening and alienation from the life that is of God depends upon their inner ignorance and hardness of heart. That this inner ignorance is not a mere limitation of the understanding, is expressed by the combination with the *πώρωσις*" (Harless).

XLVII. Ver. 21. *καθὼς ἔστιν ἀλήθεια.*

There is an antithesis here to the *ἐν ματαιότητι* of ver. 17. As opposed to this *vanity*, the quality of their teaching is here described as *truth*, while "the next verse contains its substance" (Eadie) or contents.

XLVIII. Ver. 22. *τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον.*

"A bold and vivid personification of the old nature we inherit from Adam, the source and seat of original and actual transgression" (Eadie). "Our former unconverted self; personification of our whole sinful condition before regeneration (Rom. vi. 6; Col. iii. 9), and opposed to the *καινὸς* or *νέος ἄνθρωπος* (ver. 24 ; Col. iii. 10)" (Ellicott). "The natural man in the corruption of his sin" (Braune). Meyer's exception to the reference of this by Calovius to original sin is at once answered by the fact that, with Calovius, original sin is the sinful habit, which begins to be laid aside in regeneration. The examination of the controversy with Rome on this topic in Apology of Augsburg Confession, Art ii., pp. 75–83, will give much light here.

XLIX. Ver. 26. *ἐπὶ παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν.*

"The *παροργισμός* of Eph. iv. 26 is not *ὀργή*, however we may translate it 'wrath.' This it cannot be ; for the *παροργισμός* there is absolutely forbidden ; the sun shall not go down upon it ; whereas under certain conditions *ὀργή* is a righteous passion to entertain. The Scripture has nothing in common with the stoic's absolute condemnation of anger ; it takes no such loveless view of other men's sins as his who said : 'Disturb not thyself ; if any one sins, he sins to himself' (Marc. Ant. iv. 46). It inculcates no apathy, but only a restraint over passion . . . The Scripture permits, and not only permits, but when the right occasion for it has arrived, demands it. . . . There is a 'wrath of God,' a wrath also of the merciful Son of Man (Mark iii. 5), and a wrath which righteous men not only may, but, as they are righteous, must feel ; nor can there be a surer and sadder token of an utterly prostrate moral condition than the not being able to be angry with sin—and sinners." . . . Yet "there is that which may cleave even to a righteous anger, the *παροργισμός*, the irritation, the exasperation, which must be dismissed at once" (Trench, Synonyms, First Series, 180, 181).

CHAPTER V.

Ver. 2. *ἡμας . . . ἡμῶν*] Tisch. [Treg. and West. and Hort] : *ὑμᾶς . . . ὑμῶν*. But the witnesses for this are of unequal value and not strong enough, specially as the pronoun of the second person naturally presented itself from the context. — Ver. 4. *καὶ αἰσχρ. καί*] A D* E* F G, min. Sahid. Vulg. It. and Fathers of some importance : *ἢ αἰσχρ. ἤ*. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Rück., and rightly so ; the *Recepta* appears to be an old alteration in accordance with ver. 3, where also it is only at the third vice that *ἤ* comes in. ℵ* has *καὶ αἰσχρ. ἤ*, as also Syr. p. — *τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα*] A B ℵ, 31, 67, 73, Clem. Antioch. Ephr. Cyr. : *ἃ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν*. So Lachm. and [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] Rück. ; commended also by Griesb. An interpretation, probably occasioned by the fact that the following *ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαρ.* was regarded as the contrast to *τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα*. — Ver. 5. *ἴστε*] Elz.: *ἐστέ*, in opposition to far preponderant evidence. Defended, it is true, by Matth. ("pluribus Graecis in mentem venire poterat *ἴστε*," "*ἴστε* could occur to most Greeks," but evidently a mechanical miswriting or alteration ; rejected also by Reiche, Hofmann and Ewald.— *ὅς ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης*] [Lachm. West. and Hort], following only B ℵ, 67*** lect. 40, Cyr. Jer., has *ὅ ἐστιν εἰδωλολατρης*, which Mill and Griesb. recommended. F G, Vulg. It. Goth. Victorinus, Cyprian, Ambrosiaster have *ὅ ἐστιν εἰδωλολατρεία*. By the latter the original *ὅς ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης*, which seemed to require an explanation, that it might not be misunderstood, was *explained*, and subsequently *εἰδωλολάτρης* was *restored*, whereby the reading of Lachm. arose.— Ver. 9. *φωτός*] Elz. Matth. : *πνεύματος*, in opposition to decisive witnesses. Gloss from Gal. v. 25. — Ver. 17. *συνίεντες*] A B ℵ, min. Chrys. ms. Damasc. Jer. : *συνίετε*. So Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] and Rück. Harless, however, has *συνιόντες*, after D* F G. The latter, though doubtless to be accented *συνιόντες* (see on Rom. iii. 11), is as the less common form to be preferred ; the imperative is a gloss from the context, supported by no version. — Ver. 19. *πνευματικαῖς*] is wanting only in B, Clar. Germ. Ambrosiast., and is bracketed by Lachm. It might have been introduced from Col. iii. 16 ; but the evidence for the omission is too weak, and the omission might easily be occasioned by the homoeoteleuton. — *ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*] Lachm. and Rück. : *ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις*, after important witnesses (not B). But the plural would in itself very naturally occur to the copyists, and still more from the comparison of Col. iii. 16. — Ver. 21. *Χριστοῦ*] Elz. : *Θεοῦ*, in opposition to decisive witnesses, among which D E F G, codd. of It. add *Ἰησοῦ*, some before, some after the *Χρ*. Mill already rightly judges that *φόβος Θεοῦ* was the *more current* conception, whereby *Θεοῦ* (K : *κυρίου*) was brought in ; *φόβος Χριστοῦ* does not occur elsewhere. —Ver. 22. After *ἀνδράσιν*, Elz. Scholz have *ὑποτάσσεσθε*, and Lachm. [and Treg.] *ὑποτασσέσθωσαν*. The latter in accordance with A ℵ, min. Copt. Vulg. Goth. Clem. (once) Basil, Damasc. Ambrosiast. Pelag. D E F G, lect. 19, It. Syr. have the *Recepta*, but *before τοῖς ἰδίοις*. These diversities only confirm the probability that the verb was originally wanting, as also B, codd. Gr. in Jer. Clem.

(once) have no verb. The verb, deleted by Tisch. and rejected by Reiche [and West. and Hort], is an expedient to help the construction. — Ver. 23. ἀνήρ (Elz.: ὁ ἀνήρ) and αὐτός (Elz.: καὶ αὐτός ἐστι) rest on decisive critical evidence; although Reiche again defends the *Recepta*, which is a smoothing of the text.— Ver. 24. ἰδίοις] is, following B D* E* F G ℵ, min. codd. It., with Lachm. Treg. Tisch. [West. and Hort], to be deleted as an addition from ver. 22. — Ver. 25. ἑαυτῶν] is wanting in A B ℵ, min. Clem. Orig. Cyr. Chrys. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. But if anything were *added* to γυναῖκας, it would be most natural to add ἰδίας from ver. 22. The ὑμῶν read in F G (Vulg. It. etc.: *vestras*) is an explanation of ἑαυτῶν, and tells *in favor of* this, the dropping out of which is to be explained from its superfluousness. — Ver. 27. αὐτός] Elz.: αὐτήν, in opposition to far preponderating testimony; altered from a failure to understand the emphatic αὐτός. — Ver. 28. Lachm. has rightly adopted, on decisive authority, οὕτως καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες ὀφείλουσιν. B has the order οὕτως ὀφ. καὶ οἱ ἄνδρος. — Ver. 29. Instead of Χριστός, Elz. has κύριος, in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 30. ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς ατοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστ. αὐτοῦ] is wanting in A B ℵ* 17, 67** *al.*, Copt. Aeth. Method. and perhaps Ambrosiast. Deleted by Lachm. [Treg. Tisch. West. and Hort], suspected also by Mill and Griesb., defended by Reiche. The omission has arisen either from mere accident, by passing in the process of copying from the first αὐτοῦ immediately to the third, or more probably through design, from want of perceiving the suitableness of the words in the context, and judging their meaning inappropriate. If they had been added from the LXX. Gen. ii. 23, we should have found written ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. — Ver. 31. τὸν πατ. αὐτοῦ κ. τ. μητ.] Lachm. and Tisch. on preponderant testimony have merely πατέρα καὶ μητέρα. Rightly; the *Recepta* is from the LXX. — πρὸς τὴν γυν.] Lachm. and Rück.: τῇ γυναικί, in accordance doubtless with many and considerable witnesses (not B), but an alteration in conformity with the LXX. (according to A, Ald.) and Matt. xix. 5.

CONTENTS.—Exhortation to the imitation of God, to love, as Christ through His sacrificial death has loved us (vv. 1, 2). Warning against unchastity, avarice, and other vices, inasmuch as they exclude from the Messianic kingdom (vv. 3–5). The readers are not to let themselves be deceived by empty words, and not to hold fellowship with the vicious; for, as those who from being dark have become Christianly enlightened, they are under obligation to walk accordingly, and to have no fellowship with the works of darkness, but rather to rebuke them, which is a course as necessary as it is salutary (vv. 6–14). They are therefore to be careful in their walk as wise (vv. 15–17), and not to become drunken, but to become full of the Holy Spirit, which fulness must express itself by alternate utterance in psalms and hymns, by singing praise in the silence of the heart, and by continual Christian thanksgiving towards God (vv. 18–20). Subject the one to the other in the fear of Christ, the wives are to render to their husbands true Christian subjection (vv. 21–24), and the men to their wives true Christian love (vv. 25–33), in connection with which, however, the wife owes reverence to the husband (ver. 33).

Vv. 1, 2. If Paul has just said καθὼς καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν, he now, on the ground of these words (οὖν), sums up under one head the duty of love expressed in detail, iv. 32, and that as *imitation of God* by a *loving* walk, such as stands in appropriate relation to the love shown to us by *Christ*, which serves as pattern for our conduct. With this is expressed the *specific character and degree* of the love required as an imitation of God (John xiii. 34, xv. 13). Accordingly, ver. 1 corresponds to the καθὼς καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν Χρ. ἐχαρίσατο as a whole, and ver. 2 to the ἐν Χριστῷ in particular ; γίνεσθε οὖν at the same time corresponds emphatically to the γίνεσθε δέ of iv. 32, introducing in another form—flowing from the last words of ver. 32—the same thing as was introduced by γίνεσθε δέ. — ὡς τέκνα ἀγαπ.] in accordance with your relation to God as His beloved children. ἀγαπητά denotes neither *amabiles*, "lovely,"[1] nor *good*, *excellent* children, nor is it to be said with Vater : "ut solent liberi, qui *tunc* diliguntur," "as children are wont, who are *then* loved;" but what a love has God shown to us by the υἱοθεσία (1 John iii. 1 ; Rom. v. 8, 5, *al.*) ! Now, to be God's beloved child, and not to become like the loving Father, how contradictory were this ! See Rom. vi. 1 ff. ; 1 John iv. 7 ff. ; Matt. v. 45. Yet the *expression* "imitators of *God*" is found with Paul only here. — καί] annexes wherein this imitation of God must consist, namely, therein, that *love* is the element in which their life-walk takes place—love, such as also Christ has displayed towards us.—καὶ παρέδωκεν κ.τ.λ.] Practical proof of the ἠγάπησεν. Comp. ver. 25 ; Rom. v. 8 f. ; Gal. ii. 20. Paul might have written παρέστησεν, but wrote παρέδωκ., because he *thought* of the matter as a self-surrender. The *notion of sacrifice* does not lie in the verb, but in the attributes.[2] We may add that with παρέδ. we have not to supply εἰς θάνατον,[3] but τῷ Θεῷ[4] belongs to it, to the connecting of which with εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας[5] the order of the words is opposed (comp. Ex. xxix. 18 ; Lev. i. 9, 13, 17, xxiii. 13, 18 ; Gen. viii. 21), since the emphatic prefixing of τῷ Θεῷ, if it belonged to εἰς ὀσμ. εὐωδ., would be quite without reason, inasmuch as there is not any kind of contrast (for instance, to *human* satisfaction) in the case. — ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν] *for our behalf*, in order to reconcile us to God. The idea of substitution is not expressed in the preposition,[6] but lies in the conception of a sacrifice, under which the N. T. represents the death of Christ,[7] and that, indeed, as *expiatory* sacrifice. See on Rom. v. 6 ; Gal. iii. 13. — προσφορὰν κ. θυσίαν] *as an offering and a sacrifice.* The latter (זֶבַח) is a more precise definition of the former ; for προσφορά is *everything* in general which is brought as an offering, whether it be bloody or unbloody (מִנְחָה). Comp. Ecclus. xiv. 11. Of the sacrifice of Christ, also Heb. x. 10, 14. Harless explains the joining of the two substantives to the effect that Christ, as He *was* a sacrifice for others (θυσίαν), also *presented* Himself as an offering (προσφοράν). But, apart from the fact that thus Paul must logically have written θυσίαν κ. προσφοράν (as in Ps. xl. 7 ; Heb. x. 5),

---

[1] Zanchius.

[2] In opposition to Hofmann's objection.

[3] Grotius, Harless, and others.

[4] Which Bengel, Hofmann, and others with less simplicity attach to προσφ. κ. θυσίαν.

[5] Luther, Koppe, Meier, Harless.

[6] See also van Hengel, *ad Rom.* I. p. 459 f.

[7] In opposition to Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 383 f., who makes the apostle merely say, "that Christ has gone the way of death, in order as our well-pleasing representative to come to God."

both words, in fact, state *in what character* Christ presented Himself to God, both express the *objective* relation, while the subjective relation of Christ is conveyed in *παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 18. — *εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας*] *so that it became for Him an odor of fragrance*, figurative designation of its *acceptableness to God* (Phil. iv. 18), after the Hebrew רֵיחַ־נִיחֹחַ (Lev. i. 9, 13, 17, ii. 12, iii. 5), which was the original *real*, anthropopathic basis of the *idea* of the acceptableness of a sacrifice to God.[1] The underlying notion of the *burning* of that which was offered did not of course come into account in the case of the *ἱλαστήριον* of Jesus, but the *thought* of the expression is in the sacrificial designation of the atoning deed independent of its origin.[2] — The question whether Christ is here in reality presented as an *expiatory sacrifice*, or merely as one who in His self-surrender well-pleasing to God has left us a *pattern*,[3] has been raised by the Socinians,[4] who denied the former,[5] is decided not merely by *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, but by the view prevailing throughout the N. T., and specially with Paul, of the death of Jesus as the *ἱλαστήριον*, Rom. iii. 25 (comp. also Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28; 1 Pet. i. 18; 1 Tim. ii. 6), which also is contained here in *θυσίαν*.[6] Certainly the main point in the connection of our passage is the *love* displayed by Christ, but the practical proof of this love is represented as that which it just *really was*, namely, as *expiatory sacrifice;* in opposition to which the addition *εἰς ὀσμ. εὐωδ.*, which in the O. T., save in Lev. iv. 31,[7] is not used of expiatory sacrifices, is not to be urged, inasmuch as—even apart from Lev. *l.c.*—Christ offered up *Himself*, consequently His expiatory sacrifice *was* at the same time *a voluntary* offering.

Ver. 3. *Δέ*] leading over to another portion of the exhortation. — *ἀκαθαρσία* and *πλεονεξία*, quite as at iv. 19, the two main vices of heathendom. The latter thus is here neither *insatiability in lust*,[8] nor "imprimis de *prostibulis*, quae sunt *vulgato corpore*, ut quaestum lucrentur," "especially of courtesans who prostitute their bodies for pay," Koppe, Stolz, but : *avarice*. — *ἤ*] is not equivalent to *καί*,[9] nor yet explicative,[10] but *disjunctive*, separating another vice from the correlative *πορνεία καὶ πᾶσα ἀκαθαρσία*; [11] neither fornication and every kind of uncleanness, *nor* avarice, *nor* shamelessness (ver. 4), etc. — *μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν*] *not once be named*, etc. ; *ἱκανῶς τὸ μυσαρὸν τῶν εἰρημένων ὑπέδειξε, καὶ αὐτὰς αὐτῶν προσηγορίασ τῆς μνήμης ἐξορίσαι κελεύσας*, "He sufficiently indicated that which was impure in the subjects mentioned, enjoining that their very names be banished from memory," Theodoret.[12]—

---

[1] See Gen. viii. 21 ; Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 31.

[2] Without that which is symbolized in ʻοσμὴ εὐωδίας, the sacrifice of Christ would not have been propitiatory. Comp. on the expression itself the Homeric *κνίσσης ἡδὺς ἀϋτμή*, "sweet savor of fat," *Od.* xii. 369.

[3] So Usteri, *Lehrbegr.* p. 113 ; Rückert.

[4] See *Catech. Racov.* 484, ed. Oeder, p. 1006.

[5] See also Calovius, *Bibl. ill.* p. 716 f.

[6] Comp. Lechler, *apost. und nachapost. Zeitalter*, p. 77 ; Ebrard, *Lehre von der stellvertret. Genugth.* p. 68 ff. ; Philippi, *Dogm.* IV. 2, p. 294 ff.

[7] See, with regard to this passage, Oehler in Herzog's *Encykl.* X. p. 648.

[8] As Heinsius (controverted by Salmasius, *de foen. Trap.* p. 121 ff.), Estius, Locke, Baumgarten, Michaelis, Zachariae, and others would take it.

[9] Salmasius, Schleusner.

[10] Heinsius.

[11] Comp. Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 275 f.

[12] Comp. ver. 12. Dio Chrys. p. 360 B: *στάσιν δὲ οὐδὲ ὀνομάζειν ἄξιον παρ᾽ ὑμῖν*, "It is improper for you even to mention the

καθὼς πρέπει ἁγίοις] namely, that these vices should not once be mentioned among them. So *αἰσχρὰ ὀνόματα*, "such disgraceful words"[1] are they!

Ver. 4. *Αἰσχρότης*] *abomination*, disgraceful conduct.[2] Most expositors, including Rückert, Meier, Holzhausen, Olshausen,[3] limit it to disgraceful *utterances*, but without warrant of linguistic usage (this would be *αἰσχρολογία*, see Col. iii. 8; Xen. *de rep. Lac.* v. 6; Aristot. *de rep.* vii. 17; Polyb. viii. 13. 8, xii. 13. 3); or in the context, in which it is only the following elements that contain the unchristian speaking. — *μωρολογία*] is the *carrying on of insipid, foolish talk.*[4] — *εὐτραπελία*] signifies properly *ready versatility* from *τρέπω* and *εὖ*), *urbanity;* then specially a *witty, jesting manner;* and in a bad sense, as here, the witticism of *frivolity, scurrilitas*, "scurrility."[5] [See Note L., p. 524.] — *τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα*] *as that which is unseemly.* Comp. Winer, pp. 221, 338 f. It refers only to *μωρολογία* and *εὐτραπελία*, since for *αἰσχρότης* such a characteristic description would be entirely superfluous, and *ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία*] points back merely to those peccata *oris*, "oral sins." — *ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία*] From the preceding *μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν* we have here to supply *ἔστω* or *γινέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν*, which is contained therein, in accordance with a well-known brachylogy.[6] *εὐχαριστία* is, according to standing usage,[7] not *gracefulness of speech*, as Jerome, Calvin,[8] Salmasius, Cajetanus, Hammond, Semler, Michaelis, Wahl, Meier, and others would take it, which would be *εὔχαρι*, but *giving of thanks*, in which case there results a contrast far more in keeping with the Christian character and the profoundly vivid piety of the apostle (comp. Col. ii. 7, iii. 15, 17; 1 Thess. v. 18). *Gratitude towards God* (for the salvation in Christ), expressing itself in their discourse, is to supersede among Christians the two faults before mentioned, and to sanctify their oral intercourse. "Linguae abusui opponitur sanctus et tamen laetus usus," "the holy and yet joyful use of the tongue is opposed to its abuse," Bengel. Morus erroneously refers it to thanksgiving towards *others;* "*the language of courtesy.*"

Ver. 5. Paul returns to the vices mentioned ver. 3, and *assigns the reason* for their prohibition. — *ἴστε γινώσκοντες*] *indicative;* Paul appeals to the *consciousness* of the readers, which, considering their familiarity with the principle laid down, was at all events more natural to him, and more in keeping with the destination as a motive (*γάρ*), than the *imperative* sense.[9] The *participle*, however, is not here to be explained from the well-known

---

faction." Herod. i. 138: ἅσσα δὲ σφι ποιέειν οὐκ ἔξεστι, ταῦτα οὐδὲ λέγειν ἔξεστι, "What it is not allowable to do, it is not allowable even to mention." Dem. 1259, 17: ἃ καὶ ὀνομάζειν ὀκνήσαιμ' ἄν, "which I would hesitate even to mention."

[1] Plat. *Rep.* p. 344 B, and Stallbaum *in loc.*

[2] Plat. *Gorg.* p. 525 A.

[3] Not Matthies and Harless.

[4] Antig. *de Mirab.* 126: μωρολωγίας καὶ ἀδολεσχίας, "idle talk and frivolity," Arist. *H. A.* i. 11; Plut. *Mor.* 504 A.

[5] See in general, Wetstein *ad loc.;* Dissen, *ad Pind.* p. 180; Krüger on *Thuc.* ii. 41. 1.

[6] Kühner, II. p. 604.

[7] Comp. also Loesner, *Obss.* p. 345 f.

[8] "Sermones nostros vera suavitate et gratia perfusos esse debere, quod fiet, si miscebimus utile dulci," "Our conversation should be pervaded with true sweetness and grace, which will occur if we will mingle the useful with the sweet."

[9] Vulgate, Valla, Castalio, Vatablus, Erasmus Schmid, Estius, Grotius, Wolf, Bengel, Koppe, Rückert, Matthies, Olshausen, Bleek, and others.

Hebrew and Greek mode of connecting the finite verb with its participle,[1] inasmuch as γινώσκ. is *another* verb; but it denotes the *way and manner* of the knowing.[2] — *πᾶς . . . οὐκ ἔχει*] See on iv. 29, and Winer, p. 155. — *ὅς ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης*] applies to the *covetous man*, whom Paul declares in a metaphorical sense to be an *idolater*, inasmuch as such an one has made money and property his god, and has fallen away from the service of the true God (comp. Matt. vi. 24). Comp. Phil. iii. 19; Col. iii. 5; and the passages from Philo and the Rabbins, which express the same mode of regarding covetousness and other vices, in Wetstein, and Schöttgen.[3] Doubtless *πορνεία* and *ἀκαθαρσία* are also subtle idolatry; but only with regard to avarice does Paul, here and at Col. iii. 5, bring it into special relief, in order with thoroughly deterrent force to make this felt *κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν*, "pre-eminently," as antichristian (comp. 1 Tim. vi. 10). For Paul, in particular, whose all-sacrificing self-denial (2 Cor. vi. 10, xi. 27) stood so sharply contrasted with that self-seeking passion, such a peculiar branding of *πλεονεξία* was very natural. Zachariae, Koppe,[4] Meier, Harless, as also Fritzsche,[5] refer *ὅς ἐστιν εἰδωλ.* *to all three subjects*. Unnecessary deviation from that which after the *singular* of the relative must most naturally suggest itself to the reader, and opposed to the parallel Col. iii. 5, where *ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρεία* has its reference merely to the *πλεονεξία* assured by the use of the article *τὴν πλεονεξίαν*, and it is only afterwards that the comprehension of the before-named vices by means of the neuter plural *δι᾽ ἅ* comes in. — *οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν*] Comp. on i. 11. By means of the *present* tense the *certain future* relation is *realized as present*.[6] — *ἐν τῇ βασιλ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ κ. Θεοῦ*] for the Messianic kingdom belongs to *Christ and God*, since *Christ and God* shall have the government of this kingdom. Christ opens it at His Parousia, and rules it under the supreme dominion of God (1 Cor. xv. 27) until the final consummation, whereupon He yields it up to God as the sole ruler (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28). But, after Beza, Zanchius, Glass, Bengel,[7] Rückert and Harless have explained it, on the ground of the non-repetition of the article: "*of Him, who is Christ and God*," so that Christ is here spoken of as God.[8] Incorrectly, since *Θεός* had no need of an article (see Winer, p. 110 f.; comp. *βασιλεία Θεοῦ*, 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, xv. 50; Gal. v. 21), and Christ, in accordance with the strict monotheism of the apostle (comp. iv. 6), *could* not be called by him *Θεός* in the absolute sense, and never *has* at all *been* called by him *Θεός*. See on Rom. ix.

---

[1] Winer, p. 317 f.

[2] *This you are aware of from your own knowledge*, so that I need not first to instruct you with regard to it, *that*, etc. Comp. the classic ὁρῶν καὶ ἀκούων οἶδα, "I know by seeing and hearing," Xen. *Cyr.* iv. 1. 14. Τοῦτο thus applies to the following ὅτι, not to ver. 3 f., as Winer maintains. See Kühner, II. § 631. 2.

[3] *Horae*, p. 779.

[4] Koppe, we may add, allows a choice between two arbitrary alterations of the literal meaning. The sense in his view is either: "*quae quidem flagitia regnant inter gentiles idololatras*," "which crimes prevail indeed among Gentile idolaters," or: "*as little as an idolater*."

[5] *De conformat. N. T. critica Lachm.* I. 1841, p. 46.

[6] See Bernhardy, p. 371.

[7] Comp. also Calovius.

[8] Yet Rückert is of opinion, inconsistently enough, that the question whether Paul in reality here meant it so cannot be decided, because he is not here speaking of Christ in general, but only incidentally making mention of His kingdom.

5; Col. ii. 2.[1] The designation of the kingdom as βασιλεία *of Christ and of God* is *climactic* (comp. on Gal. i. 1), and renders the warning element more solemn and more powerful to deter, through the contrast with the supreme holiness of the kingdom.[2] — On the proposition itself, comp. Gal. v. 21.

Ver. 6. *Let no one deceive you with empty words!* In those against whom the warning is here given, Grotius sees partly *heathen philosophers*, partly *Jews*, which last "omnibus Judaizantibus, quomodecunque vixissent, partem fore dicebant in seculo altero," "said that for all Judaizers no matter how they lived there would be a part in the world to come." Olshausen[3] thinks of frivolous Christians of *antinomian sentiments*, who would in future emerge; Meier, of *teachers* of Gentile tendencies. In accordance with the context (ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας, συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν, ἦτε γάρ ποτε σκότος) we have to understand Gentiles *who have remained unbelieving*, who in their intercourse with the Christians sought to palliate those Gentile vices, to give them out as matters of indifference, to represent abstaining from the same as groundless rigor, and thereby to entice back the Christians to the Gentile life. Their discourses were κένοι, inasmuch as the corresponding *contents*, *i.e.*, the *truth*, was wanting to them.[4] — διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] for certainly very serious consequences follow these vices: *on account of these vices* (διὰ ταῦτα emphatically prefixed) comes (down) the wrath of God upon the disobedient, for this vicious conduct piles up the load of guilt one day to receive punishment (Rom. ii. 5), from which they could be liberated only by means of faith in Christ, the despising of whom leaves them to abide under the wrath of God and to encounter its judicial execution. To refer ταῦτα to the *deceiving with empty words*,[5] has against it not so much the plural—since ταῦτα often also in classical writers denotes (see Winer, p. 146) *one* notion or thought (according to the aggregate of its several marks)—as rather the unsuitability of the sense in itself and to the following μὴ οὖν γίνεσθε κ.τ.λ. as well as to the parallel Col. iii. 6. — ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ] Not the *punishment of the present life* is meant,[6] since the ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ is the opposite of the βασιλεία, ver. 5; but the wrath of God *in the day of judgment*, which future, as in ver. 5, is realized as present. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 10. — The υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθ. are here those refusing faith to the gospel, and thereby disobedient to God. It is otherwise ii. 2. Comp. Rom. xi. 30, xv. 31.

Ver. 7. Οὖν] since on account of these sins, etc. — συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν] αὐτῶν can, in keeping with the context, only be referred to the υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθ., whose *co-partners* the Christians become, *if they practise the same sins*, whereby they fall from the state of reconciliation (Rom. xi. 22; 2 Pet. iii. 17) and incur the divine ὀργή (ver. 5). Koppe's interpretation: "ejusdem cum iis *fortunae* compotem fieri," "to become participant of the same fortune with them," is an importation at variance with the context (see vv. 8–11). — As to συμμέτοχος, see on iii. 6.

---

[1] Comp. Beyschlag, *Christol. d. N. T.* p. 203 f.

[2] Comp. also Ernesti, *Urspr. d. Sünde*, I. p. 207 f.

[3] Comp. Bleek.

[4] Comp. Col. ii. 8; LXX. Ex. v. 9, *al.*; Plat. *Lach.* p. 196 B; Dem. 821, 11; Hom. *Od.* xxii. 249, and the passages in Kypke, II. p. 299 f.; also κενολογία, *empty talk*, Plut. *Mor.* p. 1069 C; κενολογεῖν, Isa. viii. 19.

[5] Chrysostom places both explanations side by side; comp. Theophylact and Oecumenius.

[6] Calvin, Meier, and others; Matthies combines present and future.

Ver. 8. Reason assigned for the exhortation just given : For your former state of darkness (with which those vices were in keeping) is past ; now, on the other hand, ye are Christianly enlightened ; as befits such, let your walk be. — ἦτε] prefixed with significant stress, has the force of a ground assigned as *praeterite*, just as at Rom. vi. 17. Rückert incorrectly holds that Paul has omitted μέν, which is at variance with good composition. The non-use of μέν has its *logical* ground, and that in the fact, that the clause is *not conceived in relation to* that which thereupon confronts it by δέ. Just so in classical writers, where μέν seems to be wanting.[1] — σκότος] Abstractum pro concreto, "abstract for concrete," to make the designation the stronger (Kühner, II. p. 25 f.) : *dark*, by which the opposite of the possession of divine truth is denoted. — νῦν δὲ κ.τ.λ.] now on the other hand, since your conversion, how entirely different is it with you, how entirely different must your walk be ! *Light in the Lord* are ye, *i.e.*, furnished with divine truth in your fellowship with Christ, in whom, as the source and giver of light (ver. 14), ye live and move. Comp. i. 18. — ὡς τέκνα φωτός] *as children of light, i.e.*, as enlightened ones. Comp. 1 Thess. v. 5 ; Luke xvi. 8 ; John xii. 36. *As* such they are now to show themselves in their walk. *Without* οὖν the exhortation comes in with the greater energy.[2]

Ver. 9. Parenthetic *incitement* to the observance of the preceding summons, by holding forth the glorious fruit which the Christian illumination bears ; δοκιμάζοντες is then (ver. 10) accompanying definition to περιπατεῖτε, and the μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε, ver. 11, continues the imperative form of address. For taking the participle of ver. 10 as grammatically incorrect in the sense of the *imperative*[3] there is absolutely no ground. — γάρ] *for*, not the merely explanatory *namely*, which introduces into the whole paraenetic chain of the discourse something feeble and alien. — ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτός] indicates in a figurative manner the aggregate of the moral effects (καρπός collective, as in Matt. iii. 8 ; Phil. i. 11) which the Christian enlightenment has as its result. Comp. on Gal. v. 22.[4] — ἐν πάσῃ ἀγαθωσύνῃ] *sc.* ἐστί, so that every kind of probity (ἀγαθωσ., see on Rom. xv. 14 ; Gal. v. 22), etc., is thought of as that, in which the fruit is contained (consists).[5] — δικαιοσύνῃ] *moral rectitude*, Rom. vi. 13, xiv. 17. See on Phil. i. 11.[6] — ἀληθείᾳ] *moral truth*, opposed to hypocrisy as ethical ψεῦδος, 1 Cor. v. 8 ; Phil. i. 18, iv. 8 ; John iii. 21.

---

[1] See Krüger, *Anab.* iii. 4. 41 ; Bornemann, *ad Cyrop.* iii. 2. 12, Goth. ; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 356 f. ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 388.

[2] Comp. Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Gorg.* p. 510 C ; Dissen, *ad Pind.* Exc. II. p. 276.

[3] Bleek, following Koppe.

[4] Where what is here termed καρπ. τοῦ φωτός is called καρπ. τοῦ πνεύματος. Not as though πνεῦμα and φῶς were one and the same thing (Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychol.* p. 390), but the Spirit, through whom God and Christ dwell in the heart, Rom. viii. 9, *produces* the φῶς in the heart (2 Cor. iv. 6 ; Eph. i. 17 f.), so that the fruit of the *Spirit* is also the fruit of the *light*, and *vice versâ*. Nor is the fruit of the word sown upon the good ground anything different.

[5] Comp. Matthiae, p. 1342.

[6] According to Phil. i. 11, the Christian moral rectitude has again its καρπός in the several Christian virtues, which are the expressions of its life.

The general nature of these three words, which together embrace the *whole* of Christian morality, and that under the three different points of view "good, right, true," forbids the assumption of more special contrasts, as *e.g.* in Chrysostom : ἀγαθωσ. is opposed to wrath, δικαιοσ. to seduction and deceit, ἀληθ. to lying. Others present the matter otherwise ; see Theophylact, Erasmus, Grotius.

Ver. 10. Δοκιμάζοντες] after the parenthesis in ver. 9, a modal definition of the walk called for in ver. 8, which is to be prosecuted under a searching consideration of what is well-pleasing to Christ (τῷ κυρίῳ), as to which subjectively the Christian conscience (Rom. xiv. 23) and objectively the gospel of Christ (iv. 20 ; Rom. i. 16 ; Phil. i. 27) give the decision. Comp. ver. 15 ; Rom. xii. 2 ; 1 Thess. v. 21.

Ver. 11. Συγκοινωνεῖτε] *have not fellowship with* (the disobedient) *in the works of darkness* (comp. ver. 7 ; and as regards the dative, see on Phil. iv. 14), *i.e.*, in those works, which are wrought in consequence of spiritual darkness—of the ethical frame of mind opposed to divine truth. Comp. Rom. xiii. 12. They are the ἔργα πονηρά (Col. i. 21), the ἔργα τῆς σαρκός (Gal. v. 21), the νεκρὰ ἔργα (Heb. vi. 1), the ἔργα ἀσεβείας (Jude 15). — τοῖς ἀκάρποις] *the non-fruitful ones*, inasmuch, namely, as they draw no blessing after them. The *perdition* which they have as result (Rom. vi. 21, viii. 13 ; Gal. vi. 8 ; Eph. iv. 22, *al.*) is conceived as *negation* of blessedness (comp. ver. 5). Comp. ἔργα νεκρά, Heb. vi. 1, ix. 14. — μᾶλλον δὲ καί] *but rather even, imo adeo.* See on Gal. iv. 9 ; Rom. ix. 34. Bengel well remarks : "non satis abstinere est," "it is not enough to abstain." — ἐλέγχετε] *reprove* them (these works), which occurs when they are not passed over in silence and indulgently excused, but are held up with censure to the doer, and have their immorality discovered and brought home, in order to produce amendment. This chastening reproof is an *oral* one, since the context does not intimate anything else ; not one *de facto*, "expressed in deeds,"[1] not "dictis *et factis*," "by words and deeds."[2] Comp. on John iii. 20, xvi. 8 ; 1 Cor. xiv. 24.

Ver. 12 assigns the reason for the demand just expressed, ἐλέγχετε, by pointing to what quite specially needed the ἐλέγχειν,—by pointing to the *secret* vicious acts of the unbelievers, which are so horrible, that one must feel ashamed even but to mention them. Thus, consequently, the ἐλέγχετε has its ground assigned as concerns its great *necessity*. — κρυφῇ] not elsewhere in the N. T.[3] in the protasis has the emphasis,—hence it is prefixed,—and denotes that which takes place *in secret*, in the darkness of seclusion. More special references, such as to the horrible excesses in connection with the *heathen mysteries*,[4] or even to the "familiam *Simonis Magi*, quae erat infandarum libidinum magistra," "establishment of Simon Magus which was the mistress of dreadful lusts,"[1] have just as little warrant in the context as the weakening of the meaning of the word by Morus, who understands thereby the *mores domesticòs*, "domestic habits," of the Gentiles. According to Koppe,[2] Meier, Harless, and Olshausen, the κρυφῇ γινόμενα are not meant to be specially the *secret* deeds of vice, but *the ἔργα τοῦ σκότους in general*, which are so designated in accordance with the view conditioned by σκότος.[3] But against this may be urged, first, the fact that σκότος (here in the ethical sense) and κρυφῇ are quite different notions, inasmuch as *manifest* vice also is an ἔργον τοῦ σκότους, whereas only the peccata *occulta*, "*secret sins*," take place κρυφῇ ; secondly, the emphasis, which the prefixing of κρυφῇ demands for this word, and which, if κρυφῇ denoted nothing special, would be entirely lost, so that Paul might have written merely τὰ γὰρ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν ; thirdly, the contrast of the following φανεροῦται, which presupposes in the ἐλέγχειν something which had been done *secretly* ;[4] and lastly, that it would in fact be quite an exaggerated assertion to say *of the sins of the Gentiles generally*, that it is a shame even to mention them. — ὑπ' αὐτῶν] by the υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας. — καὶ λέγειν] *even only*[5] *to say*, what they in secret do, one must be ashamed.[6] The tacit contrast is the ποιεῖν of the doers. Compare the μηδέ of ver. 3.

---

[1] "Sancta nimirum et honesta vita," "doubtless a holy and honorable life," Beza : comp. Erasmus, Cameron, Zanchius.

[2] Bengel ; comp. Theophylact, Photius, Calovius, Holzhausen, Olshausen, and others.

[3] But see Deut. xxviii. 57 ; Wisd. xviii. 9 ; 3 Macc. iv. 12 ; Xen. *Symp.* v. 8 ; Pind. *Ol.* i. 75 ; Soph. *Trach.* 686, *Antig.* 85 ; to be written with Iota subscriptum, Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 992 ; Lipsius, *Gramm. Unters.* p. 6 f.

[4] Elsner, Wolf, Michaelis, Holzhausen.

Remark.—The confirmatory relation of ver. 12 to what precedes has been very variously apprehended, and with various definitions of the sense itself. Calvin, anticipating, holds that the intention is to state what is *accomplished* by the ἔλεγξις ; thereby light is brought into their secret things, "ut sua turpitudine pudefiant," "that they may become ashamed of their baseness," comparing 1 Cor. xiv. 24. Of this there is mention only in the sequel. Entirely at variance with the words is the view of Grotius (comp. Calovius): "*nam nisi id fiat, audebunt etiam clam turpiora,*" "for unless he were to do this, they will dare secretly even baser things." Bengel (comp. already in Oecumenius) finds in ver. 12 the cause adduced, "*cur indefinite loquatur ver.* 11 de operibus tenebrarum, cum fructum lucis ver. 9 definite descripserit," "why he speaks indefinitely, ver. 11, of the works of darkness when he definitely described, ver. 9, the fruit of light." Imported, and opposed to the emphatic κρυφῇ. While, moreover, Koppe *translates* γάρ by *doubtless* [*zwar*], Rückert wishes at least to *supply* a *doubtless*. "Doubtless their secret sins are not of such kind that they can be mentioned with honor, yet it belongs to you, as children of the light, to convince them of the wickedness of their actings." But the supplying of μέν is pure invention. See on ver. 8. Quite mistaken also is the explanation of Meier : "Yes, reprove them severely and openly to the face ; for the merely unconcerned speaking and telling of such deeds of shame secretly committed is likewise disgraceful, unworthy, and mean." This

---

[1] Estius.

[2] *Flagitia quaevis*, "any kind of crimes."

[3] See Harless.

[4] Comp. Heliodorus, viii. p. 397 : ὁ τῆς δίκης ὀφθαλμὸς ἐλέγχων καὶ τὰ ἀμήνυτα κρύφια καὶ ἀθέμιτα φωτίζων, "the eye of justice convicting and enlightening secrets unmentioned and unlawful."

[5] See Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 136.

[6] Comp. Plat. *Rep.* p. 465 C : ὀκνῶ καὶ λέγειν, "I hesitate even to mention," Dem. 1262, 11 : ἃ πολλὴν αἰσχύνην ἔχει καὶ λέγειν, "which are very shameful even to mention," and the passages in Wetstein.

Paul would at least have expressed thus: *τὸ γὰρ λέγειν μόνον* (antithesis to *τὸ ἐλέγχειν*) *τὰ κρυφῇ ὑπ' αὐτῶν γινόμενα αἰσχρ. ἐστι.* Impossible, likewise, is Holzhausen's interpretation: "The sins committed in the darkness of the heathen mysteries the Christians are *not to disclose;* they are not even to utter the names thereof, they are too abominable." Apart from the consideration how singular such a precept must appear face to face with the decidedly moral character of the apostle, apart also from the fact that the mysteries are purely imported (see above), such a view should have been precluded as well by the *γάρ* in itself (since, in fact, no *counterpart* of *κρυφῇ* precedes), as by the succeeding *τὰ δὲ πάντα*, which, according to Holzhausen, is meant to signify *the* vices, "which can endure your light." Following Anselm, Piscator, Vorstius, Zanchius, Flatt, Harless finally discovers in ver. 12 the assigning of a reason not for the *ἐλέγχετε*, which is held to follow only with ver. 13, but for *μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάρπ. τοῦ σκότους*: "for even but to mention their secret deeds is a shame, *to say nothing of doing them.*" But against this the right apprehension of the emphatic *κρυφῇ* (see above) is decisive; moreover, the exhortation *μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε κ.τ.λ.*, has already, in what precedes, such repeated and such specifically Christian grounds assigned for it (vv. 3, 4, 5, 8, as also further *τοῖς ἀκάρποις*, ver. 11), that the reader, after a *new* thought has been introduced with *μᾶλλον*, could not at all expect a second ground to be assigned for the *previous one*, least of all such a general one—containing no essentially Christian ground—as would be afforded by ver. 12, but rather would expect a ground to be assigned for the new thought *μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε* which had just been introduced.

Ver. 13. The assigning of grounds for that precept, *μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε*, is *continued*,—being attached by means of the contradistinguishing *δέ*,—inasmuch as there is pointed out the salutary action of the *Christian light* which is brought to bear by means of the required *ἐλέγχειν* upon all those secret deeds of shame: *But everything* (all those secret sins), *when it is reproved*, when you carry that *ἐλέγχετε* into effect upon it, *is by the light* (*ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός* has the emphasis) *made manifest*, is laid bare in its real moral character, unveiled and brought into distinctness before the moral consciousness by the light of Christian truth which is at work in your *ἐλέγχειν*; *by the light*, I say, it is made manifest, *for*—in order to prove by a general proposition that this cannot come otherwise than *from the light—all that which is made manifest*, which is brought forth from concealment and is laid open in its true nature, *is light*, has ceased thereby to have the nature of darkness, and is now *of the essence of light.* This demonstrative proposition is based upon the inference: "Quod est in effectu, 'what it is in effect' (*φῶς ἐστι*), id debet esse in causa, 'it ought to be in cause' (*ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός*)." If thus there is warrant for the general *πᾶν τὸ φανερούμ. φῶς ἐστι*, so must there also be warrant for what was previously said in the Christian sense, *ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανεροῦται.* [See Note LI., p. 524 seq.] From this simple explanation of the words it becomes at once clear that we have not, with most expositors,[1] to attach *ὑπὸ τοῦ φ.* to *ἐλεγχόμενα*, but to *φανεροῦται*,[2] to which it is emphatcally prefixed; and further, that *φανερούμενον* is not to be taken as *middle*, in which case again various explanations have been brought out, namely, either: "*Lux enim illud est, quod omnia facit manifesta*," "for that is light which makes all things manifest,"[1] or: "*Omne enim illud, quod manifesta facit alia, lux est*," "for everything that makes other things manifest is light,"[2] or: "Quilibet autem, 'For every one' [*γάρ* !], qui alios docet, est lux, . . . eo ipso declarat, se esse verum Christianum," "who teaches others is a light . . . and by this very thing declares that it is true Christianity,"[3] or: "he who does not refuse to be made manifest, becomes an enlightened one," Bengel,—against which interpretations not only the immediately preceding *passive φανεροῦται* is decisive, but also linguistic usage, in accordance with which *φανεροῦμαι* is *always passive*.[4] And if we adhere to the view of *φανερούμ.* as *passive*, we must exclude every explanation, in which a *quid pro quo* is perpetrated, or something is imported, or *γάρ* is either neglected or incorrectly taken. We have therefore to set aside—(1) the explanation given by Elsner and Wolf, that Paul says: "*hominum scelera in tenebris patrata, a fidelibus, qui lux sunt, improbata, non modo protrahi in lucem, verum etiam homines, illis sceleribus inquinatos, rubore suffundi increpitos convictosque, et ipsos quoque φῶς fieri hac ratione, emendatis vitiis tenebrisque in novae vitae lucem conversis*," "that the crimes of men perpetrated in darkness, condemned by believers who are light, not only are brought to the light, but also that men, stained with these crimes, chided and convicted, are covered with shame, and in this way they themselves become light, by the reformation of their vices, and the change of the darkness into the light of the new life;" (2) that of Zachariae: "*Everything which is sharply tested according to the light of the doctrine of Christ and holds its ground, one has no need to keep secret; . . . all, however, which one can perform openly and before every one's eyes . . . is itself light, and strikes every one as good and praiseworthy;*" (3) that of Storr: "*Quisquis ea, quae monitus est a luce, audit, is patefit*, emergit e tenebris; *quisquis autem patefactus est, is luce collustratus est*," "Whoever hearkens to those things which he is taught by the light is made manifest, emerges from darkness; but whoever is made manifest is illumined by the light;" that of Koppe:[5] "*for what is itself enlightened must be also a light for others;*" (5) that of Rückert, who would refer *γάρ* to a conclusion tacitly drawn from what precedes ("*ye* are light, consequently it is also your business *ἐλέγχειν τὰ ἐκείνων ἔργα*"): "*for all that is made manifest, that is, or by that very fact becomes, light*," from which again the suppressed conclusion is to be drawn: consequently it may be hoped that those also will become light, when they are convinced of the reprobate character of their action ; (6) that of Meier and Olshausen : "*for all that is enlightened by the light, is itself light*,"[1] which according to Meier is equivalent to : "becomes itself transparent and pure as light," according to Olshausen : "becomes changed into the nature of light." (7) Nearest to our interpretation comes that of Harless, followed in part by Schenkel. Harless, however, finds expressed from τὰ δὲ πάντα onward the *necessity* of the ἐλέγχειν, which is rather implied in ver. 12, to which in ver. 13 the *salutariness* of the ἐλέγχειν attaches itself ; he explains φανερούμ., moreover, as if it were praeterite, and does not retain πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμ. κ.τ.λ. in its generality as *locus communis*, inasmuch as he takes φῶς ἐστιν : is no longer a secret *work* of darkness, but is light. — According to Baur, p. 435, the proposition πᾶν τὸ φανερ. φῶς ἐστι belongs to the Gnostic theory of light,[2] and has been introduced into its present connection out of this quite different sphere of ideas. But the state of the case is exactly the converse ; the Valentinians laid hold of this utterance of the apostle as supporting their doctrine, and expressly cited it,[3] and consequently took it away from the connection in which *he* used it so as to favor *their own* theory.

---

[1] Including Baumgarten-Crusius and de Wette.

[2] Castalio, Zanchius, Zeger, Erasmus Schmid, Estius, Bengel, Meier, Harless, Olshausen, Schenkel, Bleek.

---

[1] Beza; so Calvin, Grotius, Calovius, and others, as also Bleek, who in place of φανερούμενον conjectures: φανεροῦν τό.

[2] Erasmus Schmid; so also Cajetanus, Estius, Michaelis, and others.

[3] Kuinoel in Velthusen, etc., *Commentatt.* III. p. 173 ff.

[4] The article before φῶς might (this we remark in opposition to Olshausen) be dispensed with even in Beza's explanation, so that φῶς ἐστι would have to be translated: *is light-essence*, has the nature of light. If, however,—which is not the case,—φανερούμ. were really to be translated as active, the simplest rendering, and the one most in keeping with the context, would be: *for it is the light making everything manifest.*

[5] Comp. Cramer.

Ver. 14. This necessity and salutariness of the ἔλεγξις, which Paul has just set forth in vv. 12, 13 (not of the mere subsidiary thought, πᾶν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.), he now further confirms by a word of God out of the Scripture. — διό] *wherefore*,—because the ἐλέγχετε is so highly necessary as I have shown in ver. 12, and of such salutary effect as is seen from ver. 13,—*wherefore he saith : Up, thou sleeper, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee.* This call of God to the υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας to awake out of the sleep and death of sin confirms the *necessity* of the ἔλεγξις, and this promise : "Christ shall shine upon thee," confirms the *salutary influence of the light*, under which they are placed by the ἐλέγχειν. Beza refers back διό to ver. 8, which is erroneous for this reason, if there were no other, that the citation addresses the as yet unconverted. According to Pückert,[4] the design is to give support to the hope expressed in ver. 13, namely, that the sinner, earnestly reproved and convicted, may possibly be brought over from darkness into light. But see on ver. 13. With the correct interpretation of πᾶν γὰρ κ.τ.λ., the expositions are untenable, which are given by Meier : "on that account, because only what is enlightened by the light of truth can be improved ;" and by Olshausen : "because the action of the light upon the darkness cannot fail of its effect." Harless indicates the connection only with the words of Plutarch :[5] χαίρειν χρὴ τοῖς ἐλέγχουσιν· . . . ἡμᾶς γὰρ λυποῦντες διεγείρουσιν, "Those reproving should rejoice ; for by grieving, they arouse us." Inexact, and—inasmuch as with Plutarch χαίρειν and λυποῦντες stand in emphatic correlation, and λυποῦντες thus is essential—inappropriate. — λέγει] introduces, with the supplying of ὁ Θεός (as iv. 8), *a passage of Scripture*, of which the Hebrew words would run : עוּרָה יָשֵׁן וְהָקִיצָה מִן־הַמֵּתִים וְהֵאִיר לְךָ מָשִׁיחַ. But *what* passage is that ? Already Jerome says : "*Nunquam* hoc scriptum reperi," "*Never* have I found this writing." Most expositors answer: Isa. lx. 1. So Thomas, Cajetanus, Calvin, Piscator, Estius, Calovius, Surenhusius, Wolf, Wetstein, Bengel,[1] and others, including Harless and Olshausen; while others at the same time bring in Isa. xxvi. 19,[2] as also Isa. lii. 1[3] and Isa. ix. 1.[4] But all these passages are so essentially different from ours, that we cannot with unbiassed judgment discover the latter in any of them, and should have to hold our citation—if it is assumed to contain Old Testament words—as a mingling of Old Testament reminiscences, nothing similar to which is met with, even apart from the fact that this citation bears in itself the living impress of unity and originality; hence the less is there room to get out of the difficulty by means of Bengel's expedient: "apostolus expressius loquitur ex luce N. T.," "The Apostle speaks more expressly according to N. T. light." Doubtless Harless says that the apostle was here concerned not about the *word*, but about the matter in general, and that he cites the word of pre-announcement with the modification which it has itself undergone through fulfilment, and adduces by way of analogy Rom. x. 6 ff. But in opposition to this may be urged, first generally, that *such* a modification of Isa. lx. 1 would have been not a mere modification, but would have quite done away with the identity of the passage; secondly, in particular, that the passage Isa. lx. 1, specially according to the LXX. (*φωτίζου, φωτίζου Ἰηρουσαλὴμ, ἥκει γάρ σου τὸ φῶς, καὶ ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐπὶ σὲ ἀνατέταλκεν*), needed no change whatever in order to serve for the intended Scriptural confirmation, for which, moreover, various other passages from the O. T. would have stood at the command of the apostle, without needing any change; and lastly, that Rom. x. 6 is not analogous, because there the identity with Deut. xxx. 12–14 is unmistakably evident *in the words themselves*, and the additions *concerning Christ* are not there given as constituent parts of the *Scripture utterance*, but expressly indicated as elucidations *of the apostle* (by means of *τοῦτ᾽ ἔστι*). Quite baseless is the view of de Wette, that the author is quoting, as at iv. 8 (where, indeed, the citation is quite undoubted), an O. T. passage in an application which, by frequency of use, has become so familiar to him that he is no longer precisely conscious of the distinction between text and application. *Others*, including Morus, have discovered here a quotation from an *apocryphal book*, under which character Epiphanius names the prophecy of *Elias*, Georgius Syncellus an *apocryphal* authority of *Jeremiah*, and Codex G on the margin, the book ("Secretum") of *Enoch.*[5] That, however, Paul *wittingly* cited an apocryphal book,[6] is to be decisively rejected, inasmuch as this is never done by him, but, on the contrary, the formula of citation always means canonical passages. Hence, also, we have not, with Heumann,[1] Michaelis, Storr, Stolz, Flatt, to guess at an *early hymn of the Church* as the source.[2] *Others* have found therein a saying of *Christ*, like Oeder,[3] in opposition to which may be urged, not indeed the following ὁ Χριστός, which Jesus might doubtless have said of Himself, but rather the fact that the subject Χριστός to λέγει could not be at all divined, as indeed Paul has never adduced sayings of Christ in his Epistles. This also in opposition to the opinion mentioned in Jerome,[4] that Paul here, after the manner of the prophets (comp. the prophetic : *thus saith the Lord*), "προσωποποιίαν Spiritus sancti figuraverit," "uttered a prosopopoeia of the Holy Ghost." Grotius[5] regards even τὸ φῶς as subject : "*Lux illa*, i.e., *homo luce perfusus, dicit alteri*," "the light, *i.e.*, a man pervaded with light, says to another." As if previously the φῶς were *homo luce perfusus!* "a man pervaded with light," and as if every reader could not but have recognized a citation as well in διὸ λέγει as in the character of the saying itself ! Erroneously Bornemann also[6] holds that λέγει is to be taken *impersonaliter*, "impersonally ;" *in this respect it is said, one may say*, so that no passage of Scripture is cited, but perhaps allusion is made to Mark v. 41. This impersonal use is found only with φησί. See the instances cited by Bornemann, and Bernhardy, p. 419. In view of all these opinions, my conclusion, as at 1 Cor. ii. 9, is to this effect : From διὸ λέγει it is evident that Paul *desired* to adduce a passage of *canonical* Scripture, but—as the passage is not canonical—in virtue of a *lapsus memoriae* he adduces an *apocryphal* saying, which, citing from memory, he held as canonical. From *what* Apocryphal writing the passage is drawn, we do not know. [See Note LII., p. 525.] — ἔγειρε] *up!* Comp. ἄγε, ἔπειγε. See, in opposition to the form of the *Recepta* ἔγειραι,[7] Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 55 f. — ὁ καθεύδων] and then ἐκ νεκρῶν form a climactic twofold description of the state of man under the dominion of sin, in which state the true spiritual life, the moral vital activity, is suppressed and gone, as is the physical life in the sleeping (comp. Rom. xiii. 11) and in the dead respectively. Comp. Isa. lix. 10. How often with the classical writers, too, the expression *dead* is employed for the expression of moral insensibility, see on Matt. viii. 22 ; Luke xv. 14 ; Musgrave, *ad Oed. R.* 45 ; Bornemann, *in Luc.* p. 97.[8] — ἀν-

---

[1] Olshausen.

[2] "All development takes place only through that which in itself already exists becoming manifest for the consciousness."

[3] τοῦτο δὲ ὁ Παῦλος λέγει κ.τ.λ., "And this Paul says," etc., in Iren. i. 8. 5.

[4] Comp. Erasmus, *Paraphr.*

[5] Tom. xiv. p. 364, ed. Hutt.

---

[1] Who, however, at the same time following older expositors in Wolf (comp. Rosenmüller, *Morgenland*, VI. p. 142) called to his aid a reminiscence of the "*formula in festo buccinarum adhiberi solita*," "a formula that used to be employed at the feast of trumpets." See, in opposition to the error as to the existence of such a formula, based upon a passage of Maimonides, Wolf, *Curae*.

[2] Beza, Calixtus, Clericus, Meier Baumgarten-Crusius, and others.

[3] Schenkel.

[4] Baumgarten, Olshausen.

[5] See, in general, Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudepigr. V. T.* pp. 1074, 1105; *Apocr. N. T.* I. p. 524.

[6] According to Jerome, he is held not to have done it, "quod apocrypha comprobaret, sed quod et Arati et Epimenidis et

---

Menandri versibus sit abusus ad ea, quae voluerat, in tempore comprobanda," "because he approved the Apocrypha, but because he adapted the verses of Aratus, Epimenides, and Menander to those things that he wished at the time to be approved."

[1] *Poicile*, II. p. 390.

[2] This opinion is already mentioned by Theodoret : τινὲς δὲ τῶν ἑρμηνευτῶν ἔφασαν πνευματικῆς χάριτος ἀξιωθέντας τινὰς ψαλμοὺς συγγράψαι, "some of the interpreters said that those endowed with spiritual grace composed certain psalms," in connection with which they had appealed to 1 Cor. xiv. 26. Bleek, too, *ad loc.*, and already in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 331, finds it probable that the saying is taken from a writing composed by a Christian poet of that early age.

[3] *Syntagm. Obss. sacr.* p. 697 ff.

[4] Comp. also Bugenhagen and Calixtus.

[5] Comp. Koppe.

[6] *Schol. in Luc.* p. xlviii. f.

[7] So also Lachmann.

[8] On ὁ καθεύδων, comp. *Sohar. Levit.* f. 33, c. 130 : "*Quotiescunque lex occurrit, toties omnia hominum genera excitat, verum omnes somno sepulti jacent in peccatis, nihil intelligunt neque attendunt*," "As often as the law occurs, it excites all classes of men, but

άστα] On the form, see Winer, p. 73 ; Matthiae, p. 484. —*ἐπιφαύσει*] from *ἐπιφαύσκω*, see Winer, p. 82 ; Job xxv. 5, xxxi. 26. The readings *ἐπιψαύσει σοι ὁ Χρ.* and *ἐπιψαύσεις τοῦ Χρ.* are ancient,[1] and are not to be explained merely from an accidental interchange in copying, but are connected with the preposterous fiction that the words were addressed to *Adam* buried under the cross of Christ, whom Christ would *touch* with His body and blood, thereby causing him to become alive and to rise. See Jerome. The words themselves : Christ shall *shine upon* thee, signify not : *He will be gracious to thee*,[2] but : He will by the gracious operation of His Spirit annul in thee the ethical darkness,[3] and impart to thee the divine *ἀλήθεια*, of which He is the possessor and bearer (Christ, *the light* of the world). Observe, moreover, that the arising is not an act of one's own, independent of God and anticipating His gracious operation, but that it takes place only through God's effectual awakening call. On this effectual *calling* then ensues the Christian *enlightening*.

Ver. 15. *Οὖν*] is, after the digression begun with *μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε* of ver. 11, *resumptive*, as at iv. 17. *Look then to it*—now to return to my exhortations with regard to the Christian walk, vv. 8–10—*how ye*, etc. Calvin, whom Harless follows, states the connection thus : "Si aliorum discutere tenebras fideles debent fulgure suo, quanto minus caecutire debent in proprio vitae instituto," "If believers ought by their brightness to disperse the darkness of others, how much less should they be blind in their own course of life." This would be correct, if Paul had written *βλέπετε οὖν αὐτοί*, or *βλέπετε οὖν, πῶς αὐτοί*. — *βλέπετε*] is the simple : *look to*, *take heed to* (1 Cor. xvi. 10 ; Phil. iii. 2 ; Col. iv. 17), not : "utimini luce vestra ad videndum," "use your light for seeing," Estius,[4] which is forbidden by *πῶς*. — *πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε*] *πῶς* not equivalent to *ἵνα*,[5] and *περιπατεῖτε* not for the *subjunctive*,[6] but : *look to it, in what manner ye carry out the observance of an exact walk in strict accord with duty*.[7] Comp. C. F. A. Fritzsche, in *Fritzschior. Opusc.* p. 208 f. ; Winer, p. 269. —*μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι, κ.τ.λ.*] Epexegesis of the *ἀκριβῶς* just mentioned, negative and positive : *presenting yourselves in your walk not as unwise, but as wise*. We have thus to supply neither *περιπατοῦντες*[8] nor anything else ; but, like *ἀκριβῶς*, its more precise definition *μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι κ.τ.λ.* is dependent on *περιπατεῖτε*. With regard to *μή*, referring to *βλήπετε*, see Winer, p. 421 ; and for the emphatic *parallelismus antitheticus*, "antithetical parallelism," comp. Nägelsbach,[9] Bremi,[10] Winer, p. 537 f.

Ver. 16. Accompanying modal definition to the preceding *ὡς σόφοι* : *ementes vobis*, "buying for yourselves" (middle) *opportunitatum*, "the opportunity," i.e., *in that you make your own the right point of time for such walk*, do not let it pass by unused. In this figurative conception the doing of that for which

---

they all lie in sins, buried in sleep, and neither understand, nor attend to aught."

[1] See Chrysostom and Jerome *ad loc.*

[2] So, at variance with the context, Bretschneider.

[3] *λύων τὴν νύκτα τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, "dispersing the night of sin," Gregory of Nazianzus.

[4] Comp. Erasmus.

[5] Koppe.

[6] Grotius.

[7] Comp. *ἀκριβοδίκαιος*, Arist. *Eth. Nic.* v. 10. 8.

[8] Harless.

[9] *Anm. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 80 f.

[10] *Ad Dem. de Chers.* p. 108, 73.

the point of time is fitted, is thought of as the *purchase-price*, by which the *καιρός becomes ours.*[1] *Others* have thought of the sacrifice of all earthly things and of all lusts as the purchase-price ;[2] but this is imported, since the context yields nothing else than the *fulfilment of duty* meant by the ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖν ; hence we have not, with Harless, to interpret it of the right moment "for letting the light of correction break in upon the darkness of sin,"[3] which would be to revert, at variance with the context, to the topic of the ἔλεγξις already ended. Luther[4] incorrectly renders : "Suit yourselves to the time." That would be δουλεύειν τῷ καιρῷ, Rom. xii. 11. Similarly also Grotius :[5] "quovis labore ac verborum honestis obsequiis vitate pericula et diem de die ducite," "In any labor, and honorable obedience of words, avoid dangers and pass the time." Comp. Bengel, who compares Amos v. 13, and understands the prudent letting the evil day pass over "quiescendo vel certe modice agendo," "by resting, or certainly by working moderately," whereby the better time is *purchased*, in order to make the more use thereof. In opposition to Grotius and Bengel, it may be urged that this alleged mode of the ἐξαγοράζειν τὸν καιρόν is not mentioned by Paul, but imported by the expositor, and that the counsel of *such* a *trimming* behavior is hardly compatible with the moral decision of the apostle, and with his expectation of the approaching end of the αἰὼν οὗτος. We may add that the *compound* ἐξαγορ. is not here to be understood as *redeem* (Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5), as *e.g.*, Bengel would take it (*from the power of evil men*), and Calvin (from the *devil*), seeing that the context does not suggest such reference ; but the ἐκ in the composition is intensive, and denotes what is *entire*, *utter*, as also in Plut. *Crass.* 2 ; Polyb. iii. 42. 2 ; Dan. ii. 8. [See Note LIII., p. 525.] — ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραί εἰσι] supplies a motive for the ἐξαγ. τ. καιρ., *for the days*, the present times, *are evil*, for moral corruption is now in vogue. So much the more must it intimately concern you as Christians (for how exalted is their task above the wickedness of the present time ! Phil. ii. 15, iii. 20) τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγοράζεσθαι. Beza, Flacius, Grotius, Hammond, Rosenmüller, and others refer πονηραί to the *misfortune* of the time (Gen. xlvii. 9 ; Ps. xlix. 6 [5]) ; but the *context* opposes the moral bearing of the Christian to the immoral condition of the time. According to de Wette's here very unfounded scepticism, the writer is indistinct and hesitating, because he is bringing Col. iv. 5 into another connection.

Ver. 17. Διὰ τοῦτο] Because ye ought so to walk as is said in vv. 15, 16, of which ye as ἄφρονες (whose walk, in fact, cannot be *wise*) would be incapable. Others : *because the times are evil.*[6] But the ὅτι αἱ ἡμ. πον. εἰσι was only a subsidiary thought subservient to the *ἀγοράζ. τ. καιρ.*, and affords no suitable reason for the following exhortations. — *μὴ γίνεσθε*] not : *be* not, but *become* not. — *ἄφρονες*] *devoid of intelligence, imprudentes, i.e.*, "qui mente non recte utuntur," "those who do not use the mind aright,"[1] namely, for the moral understanding of the will of Christ, as here the contrast teaches. Comp. on *φρόνησις*, i. 8. The *ἄσοφοι* of ver. 15 is a higher notion than *ἄφρονες*, which latter denotes the *want of practical understanding*, the opposite of *φρόνιμος*.[2] Every *ἄφρων* is also *ἄσοφος*, but the *ἄσοφος* may yet be *φρόνιμος* (Luke xvi. 8), namely, for immoral ends and means, which here the context excludes. See also the following contrast. — *συνίοντες*] *understanding*, more than *γινώσκοντες*. Comp. Grotius, and see on Col. i. 9. — *τὸ θέλ. τοῦ κυρ.*] of Christ. Comp. Acts xxi. 14 ; 1 Cor. iv. 19.

---

[1] Comp. Col. iv. 5; LXX. Dan. ii. 8; Atonin. vi. 26: κερδαντέον τὸ παρόν, "the present must be bought," Plut. *Philop.* 15: καιρὸν ἁρπάζειν, "to seize an opportunity." The opposite is καιρὸν παρίεναι, "the opportunity passes by," Thucyd. iv. 27. Gal. vi. 10 is parallel as to *substance.* Classical writers say καιρ. πρίασθαι, "to purchase an opportunity," Dem. 120. 26, 187. 22, but in the proper sense of buying for money.

[2] Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius ; comp. also Augustine, Flacius, Zanchius, Estius, Rückert, and others.

[3] Comp. Michaelis and Rosenmüller.

[4] Who in earlier editions had rightly : *release the time.*

[5] Comp. Hammond.

[6] Menochius, Zanchius, Estius, *et al.*, including Rückert, Matthies, and de Wette.

Ver. 18. Καί] *and in particular*, to mention a single vice, which would belong to *ἀφροσύνη*. — *μὴ μεθύσκ. οἴνῳ*] *become not drunken through wine*, which stands opposed to the *allowable* use of wine, without our having on that account to seek here a reference to Montanism.[3] To conclude, however, from ver. 19 that excess at the *Agapae* is meant (1 Cor. xi. 21), as Koppe and Holzhausen maintain,[4] is quite arbitrary ; inasmuch as neither in the preceding nor following context is there any mention made of the *Agapae*, and this special abuse, the traces of which in the N. T. are, moreover, only to be found in Corinth, would have called for a special censure. — *ἐν ᾧ ἐστιν ἀσωτία*] deterring remark. *ἐν ᾧ* does not apply to *οἴνῳ* alone, as Schoettgen holds,[5] but to the *μεθύσκεσθαι οἴνῳ* : *wherein is contained debauchery*, dissolute behavior. A vivid description of the grosser and more refined *ἀσωτία* may be seen in Cicero.[6] On the word itself (in its literal sense *unsavableness*), see Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 152 ; Lobeck, *Paralip.* I. p. 559. A more precise limitation of the sense[7] is without warrant in the text. — *ἀλλὰ πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι*] *but become full by the Spirit.* The imperative *passive* finds its explanation in the possibility of resistance to the Holy Spirit and of the opposite fleshly endeavor ; and *ἐν* is *instrumental*, as at i. 23 ; Phil. iv. 19. The *contrast* lies not in *οἶνος* and *πνεῦμα*,[8] because otherwise the text must have run *μὴ οἴνῳ μεθύσκ., ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι πληρ.*, but in the two *states*—that of intoxication and that of inspiration. This opposition is only *in appearance* strange,[9] and has its sufficient ground in the excitement of the person inspired and its utterances (comp. Acts ii. 13). [See Note LIV., p. 525.]

Ver. 19. Accompanying definition to the just required "being filled by the Spirit," as that with which this *λαλεῖν ἑαυτοῖς ψαλμοῖς κ.τ.λ.* is to be simultaneously combined as its immediate *expression : so that ye speak to one another through psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.* What a contrast with the preceding *ἐν ᾧ ἐστιν ἀσωτία* ! Comp. Col. iii. 16. — *λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς*] not *meditantes vobiscum*, "meditating with you,"[1] but it denotes the *reciprocal speaking* (*ἑαυτοῖς*, in the sense of *ἀλλήλοις*, as iv. 32, *to each other*), the oral interchange of thoughts and feelings, which—just because the condition is that of being filled by the Spirit—does not make use of the conversational language of ordinary life, or even of drunken passion, but of psalms, etc., as the means of mutual communication (dativus *instrumentalis*, "instrumental dative ;" Luther incorrectly renders : *about* psalms[2]). That, however, the apostle is here speaking of actual *worship* in the narrower sense,[3] is assumed in opposition to the context, since the contrast *μὴ μεθύσκ. οἴνῳ, ἀλλὰ πληρ. ἐν πν.* does not characterize the *λαλεῖν ἑαυτοῖς* as taking place in worship, although *in itself* it is not denied that in worship too the inspired antiphonal singing took place.[4] The distinction between *ψαλμός* and *ὕμνος* consists in this, that by *ψαλμ.* Paul denotes *a religious song in general bearing the character of the O. T. psalms*, but by *ὑμν.* specially a *song of praise*,[5] and that, in accordance with the context, addressed to Christ (ver. 19) and God (ver. 20). Properly *ψαλμός* (which originally means the making the cithara sound) is a song in general, and that indeed as sung to a stringed instrument;[6] but in the N. T. the character of the psalm is determined by the psalms of the O. T., so called *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, "pre-eminently" (1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26 ; Jas. v. 13). According to Harless, the two words are not different as regards their contents, but *ψαλμοῖς* is the expression of the spiritual song for the *Jewish-Christians*, *ὕμνοις* for the *Gentile-Christians*. An external distinction in itself improbable, and very arbitrary, since the special signification of *ὕμνος*, *song of praise*, is thoroughly established, and *ψαλμός* also was a word very current in Greek, which—as well in itself as more especially with regard to its sense established in Christian usage in accordance with the conception of the O. T. psalms—could not but be equally intelligible for the Gentile-Christians as for the Jewish-Christians.[7] According to Olshausen, *ψαλμοί* are here the *psalms of the O. T.*, which had passed over from the synagogue into the use of the church. But worship is not spoken of here ; and that the Christians, filled by the Spirit, *improvised* psalms, is clear from 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26. Such *Christian* psalms and hymns are meant, as the Spirit gave them to be uttered (Acts ii. 4, x. 46, xix. 6),—phenomena doubtless, which, like the operations of the Spirit generally in the first age of the church, are withdrawn from our special cognizance. — *καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευμ.*] Inasmuch as *ᾠδή* may be any song, even secular, *πνευματικαῖς* is here added, so that by *ᾠδαῖς πνευμ.* is denoted the whole

---

[1] Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 143.

[2] Plat. *Gorg.* p. 498 B ; Xen. *Mem.* ii. 3, 1 ; comp. Rom. ii. 20 ; 1 Cor. xv. 36 ; Luke xi. 40, xii. 20.

[3] Schwegler.

[4] Comp. also de Wette.

[5] Whose Rabbinical passages therefore, as *Bammidb. rabba*, f. 206, 3 : "*ubicunque est vinum, ibi est immunditia*," "wherever there is wine, there is uncleanness," are not to the point here.

[6] *De Fin.* ii. 8.

[7] Jerome understands *lascivious* excess, as also Hammond, who thinks of the Bacchanalia.

[8] Grotius, Harless, Olshausen, and others.

[9] In opposition to de Wette.

---

[1] Morus, Michaelis.

[2] Pliny, *Ep.* x. 97 : Carmen Christo quasi Deo dicunt *secum invicem*," "they sing with one another a hymn to Christ as God" (ἑαυτοῖς).

[3] Olshausen.

[4] See 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26 ; Niceph. Call. xiii. 8 : τὴν τῶν ἀντιφώνων συνήθειαν ἄνωθεν ἀποστόλων ἡ ἐκκλησία παρέλαβε, "The church received the use of antiphons from the times of the apostles." A *collection* of church-hymns is of course not even remotely to be thought of in our passage ; and it is to *go in quest* of a reason for suspecting our Epistle, when, with Schwegler, the mention of ψαλμοὶ κ.τ.λ. is designated as surprising.

[5] Plat. *Legg.* iii. p. 700 B, opposed to θρῆνος.

[6] See Spanheim, *ad Callim.* p. 55.

[7] See also Rudelb. in the *Zeitschr. f. Luth. Theol.* 1855, 4, p. 634 f.

genus, of which the *ψαλμοί* and *ὕμνοι* were *species*. *πνευματικαῖς* defines the songs *as proceeding from the Holy Spirit*, as *θεοπνεύστους*.[1] It is to be observed, moreover, that Paul does not require a *constant* *λαλεῖν ἑαυτοῖς ψαλμοῖς κ.τ.λ.* on the part of his readers, but, in contradistinction to the heathen *ἀσωτία* in drunkenness, as that which is to take place among the Christians instead of drunken revelry with its dissolute doings. — The *cumulation* *ψαλμ. κ. ὕμν. κ. ᾠδ. πν.* belongs to the animated and urgent style of discourse.[2] — *ᾄδοντες καὶ ψάλλοντες ἐν τῇ καρδ. ὑμ. τῷ κυρίῳ*] *co-ordinate* with the preceding *λαλοῦντες κ.τ.λ.*, containing *another* singing of praise, namely, that which goes on *in the silence of the heart*. The point of difference lies in *ἐν ταῖς καρδ. ὑμ.*, as contradistinguished from the preceding *ἑαυτοῖς*. *Usually* this second participial clause is regarded as *subordinate* to the previous one; it is held to affirm that that reciprocal singing of praise must take place not merely with the mouth, but also in the heart.[3] But how could it have occurred to Paul here to enter such a protest against mere lip-praise, when he, in fact, represents the psalm-singing, etc., as the utterance of the being filled by the Spirit, and makes express mention of *πνευματικαῖς ᾠδαῖς*, in which case, at any rate, the thought of a mere singing with the mouth was of itself excluded. The right view is found substantially in Rückert (who, nevertheless, already here imports an "*always*"), Harless, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel. — *τῷ κυρίῳ*] *to Christ*, ver. 20.

Ver. 20. A third modal definition to the *πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι*, likewise co-ordinate with the two preceding ones, bringing into prominence—after the general *singing of praise*, etc., of ver. 19, which is to take place as well audibly as in the heart—further, and in particular, the *thanksgiving*, which the readers have always for all things to render to God. — *πάντοτε*] This *always* is not to be pressed; see on 1 Cor. i. 4; in accordance with Col. iii. 17, *at all action in word and work*. Observe, however, that *πάντοτε* is only introduced at *this* point; for not the *ᾄδειν* and *ψάλλειν*, but certainly, amidst the constant consciousness of the divine manifestations of grace, *thanksgiving* also, like prayer in general, may and ought to belong to the constant activity of the Christian life. Comp. vi. 18; Rom. xii. 12; Col. iv. 2; 1 Thess. v. 17. For the emphatic juxtaposition *πάντοτε ὑπὲρ πάντων*, comp. 2 Cor. ix. 8, and see Lobeck, *Paralip.* I. p. 56. This *πάντων* is not *masculine*,[4] but *neuter*, and relates, in accordance with the context, to *all Christian blessings*. To understand it of *all that happens to us*, even including *sufferings*, as is done by Chrysostom,[5] Jerome, Erasmus, and many, including Meier, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, and de Wette, is foreign to the connection, yet doubtless the Christian *παράκλησις* and joy in suffering belong thereto. — *ἐν ὀνόμ. τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ.*] not *ad honorem Christi*, "for the honor of

---

[1] Pind. *Ol.* iii. 18: *θεύμοροι νίσσοντ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀνθρώπους ἀοιδαι*, "songs allotted by the gods go to men."

[2] See Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc.* p. xxviii. f. Comp. also Lobeck, *Paralip.* I. p. 60 f.

[3] *τῇ καρδίᾳ ψάλλει ὁ μὴ μόνον τὴν γλῶτταν κινῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν νοῦν εἰς τὴν τῶν λεγομένων κατανόησιν διεγείρων*, "Not only does he make melody in his heart who moves his tongue, but he who excites his mind to the understanding of the things said," Theodoret.

[4] Theodoret.

[5] Chrysostom, in fact, includes even *hell* therein, the contemplation of which is for us a check of fear and thus very salutary.

Christ,"[1] but: so that what is embraced in the name Jesus Christ[2] is the element, in which your grateful consciousness moves in the act of thanksgiving. Comp. Col. iii. 17; John xiv. 13. As regards subject matter, ἐν Χριστῷ (iii. 21) would be different, and διὰ Χριστοῦ (Rom. vii. 25) similar. — τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρί] See on i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 24. The referring of πατρί to *Christ*, the Son,[3] is more in keeping with the connection (ἐν ὀνόματι κ.τ.λ.) than the rendering: *our Father.*[4]

Ver. 21 f.[5] The words ὑποτασσ. ἀλλήλ. ἐν φόβῳ Χρ. still belong to ver. 20,[6] parallel to the εὐχαριστοῦντες κ.τ.λ., adding to this relation towards God the *mutual* relation towards *one another*. Then begins with αἱ γυναῖκες a new section, into the first precept of which we have to take over the verb from the ὑποτασσόμενοι just used, namely, ὑποτάσσεσθε[7] or ὑποτασσέσθωσαν (Lachmann). Calvin, Zanchius, Koppe, Flatt, Meier, Matthies, and others,[8] incorrectly hold that the participle is to be taken *imperatively;* in that case an ἐστέ to be supplied in thought must, as in Rom. xii. 9, have been suggested by the context. Olshausen quite arbitrarily proposes that we supply mentally: "*are all believers.*" If the new section was to begin with ὑποτασσ., then ὑποτασσ. ἀλλ. ἐν φ. Χρ. would have to be regarded as an absolutely prefixed general attribute, to which the special one afterwards to be adduced would be subordinate ("inasmuch as ye subject yourselves in the fear of Christ, the wives ought," etc.). It would not militate against this view, that in the sequel only the ὑπόταξις of the *wives* follows, while the ὑπακοή of the *children* and *servants*, in chap. vi., can no longer be brought into connection with our ὑποτασσόμενοι. For often with the classical writers also, after the prefixing of such absolute nominatives, which have reference to the whole collectively, the discourse passes only over to one part (not to several).[9] But against it may be urged the consideration that αἱ γυναῖκες has no special verb; such a verb, and one correlative as to notion with ὑποτασσ., could not but be associated with it.—On the thought ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἀλλήλοις, comp. 1 Pet. v. 5; Clem. *Cor.* i. 38. — ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ] is the fundamental disposition, in which the ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἀλλήλοις is to take place. And Christ is to be *feared* as the *judge*. Comp. 2 Cor. v. 11; 1 Cor. x. 22. — τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν] *to their own husbands.* Without being misunderstood, Paul might have written merely τοῖς ἀνδράσιν, but ἰδίοις serves to make the obligation of the ὑποτάσσεσθαι τοῖς ἀνδράσιν palpable in its natural necessity; for what a wife is she, who refuses obedience *to her own husband!*[10] Throughout the N. T. *ἴδιος* never stands in place of the mere possessive pronoun, but has always, as also with the Greeks, an emphasis to be derived from the connection, even at Matt. xxii. 5, xxv. 14 (see *in loc.*) ; 1 Pet. iii. 1 ; and Tit. ii. 5 (where the relation is as in our passage). This in opposition to Winer, p. 139, and at the same time in opposition to Harless and Olshausen, who[1] see in *ὁ ἴδιος ἀνήρ* nothing more than a designation which has become usual for the *husband*. From the very context, in itself *ὁ ἀνήρ* is husband.[2] That which, on the other hand, Bengel finds in *ἰδίοις* : "etiamsi alibi meliora viderentur habere consilia," "even though elsewhere they should seem to have better judgment," is imported. — *ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ*] By this is not meant the *husbands*,[3] which must have been *τοῖς κυρίοις*, but *Christ*, and *ὡς* expresses the mode of view in which the wives are to regard their obedience towards the husbands, namely, as *rendered to the Lord ;* comp. vi. 6, 7. For the husband (see what follows) stands in relation to the wife not otherwise than as Christ to the church ; in the conjugal relation the husband is the one who represents Christ to the wife, in so far as he is head of the wife, as Christ is the Head of the church. To find in *ὡς* the mere *relation of resemblance*[4] is erroneous on account of what follows ; the passage must have run in the form *ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία τῷ κυρίῳ*, which Erasmus has imported into his paraphrase : "non aliter, quam *ecclesia*, subdita est Domino Jesu," "not otherwise than as the church is the subject to the Lord Jesus." We may add that the view of Michaelis—that here and Col. iii. 18 the teachings as to marriage are directed *against errors of the Essenes* (comp. 1 Tim. iv. 3)—is the more to be regarded as a fiction, inasmuch as Paul is speaking not of the propriety of marriage, but of the duties of the married life.

---

[1] Flatt.

[2] Per quem omnia nobis obtingunt," "by whom all things become ours," Bengel.

[3] Erasmus, Estius, Harless, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others.

[4] Zanchius, Rückert [Bleek], Matthies, [Braune], and others.

[5] A more sublime, more ideal regulation of the married state is not conceivable than that which is here set forth by the apostle, vv. 21–33, and yet it is one which has flowed from the living depth of the Christian consciousness, and hence is practically applicable to all concrete relations.

[6] So Lachmann, Tischendorf, Bleek [West. and Hort].

[7] Elzevir.

[8] Comp. also Reiche, *Comm. crit.* p. 183.

[9] See particularly Nägelsbach, *z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 385 f.

[10] So also Stobaeus, *S.* 22: Θεανῶ . . . ἐρωτηθεῖσα, τί πρῶτον εἴη γυναικί, τὸ τῷ ἰδίῳ, ἔφη, ἀρέσκειν ἀνδρί, "Theano, being asked what was the first thing to a wife, 'To please,' said he, 'her own husband.'"

Vv. 23, 24. *Ὅτι ἀνὴρ . . . ἐκκλησίας*] Reason assigned for the *ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ* just demanded. For the husband is in the marriage relation the same as Christ is in relation to the church ; the former, like the latter, is the head. — *ἀνήρ*] *a husband is head of his wife ;* hence *ἀνήρ* is *without*, and *γυναικός with* the article. — *ὡς καί*] *as also* with Christ the relation of being Head exists, namely, in regard to the church. — *αὐτὸς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος*] is *usually* taken as apposition to *ὁ Χριστός*,[5] according to which *αὐτός* would take up the subject again with special emphasis :[6] "*He*, *the Saviour of the body*," He who makes His body, *i.e.*, the church, of which He is the Head, partaker of the Messianic *σωτηρία*.[7] But while there is not here apparent from the connection any purpose, bearing on the matter in hand, for such an emphatic description,[8] there may be urged against it the following *ἀλλά*, which, if it is not placed in combination with αὐτὸς ὁ σωτ. τ. σώμ., admits of no logical explanation. *Usually*, it is true, this ἀλλά is taken *syllogistically*.[1] But the syllogistic ἀλλά, and that in the Greek writers combined with μήν, is employed for the introduction of the *propositio minor*, "minor proposition;"[2] whereas here we should have the *conclusio*, "conclusion," and we should thus have to take ἀλλά, in accordance with its discontinuative force,[3] *for* ὥστε, against which, however, militates the fact that the sentence assigning a reason, ὅτι ἀνήρ κ.τ.λ., has already fulfilled its destined object (ver. 22), so that it could not occur to any reader to seek in the adversative ἀλλά an inference from this confirmatory clause. If Paul had wished again to *infer*, from ver. 23, that which is *proved* by this verse, he would have written οὖν or the metabatic δέ. Besides this, however, ver. 24, as an inference from ver. 23, would contain a very superfluous prolixity of the discourse, inasmuch as the contents of ver. 24 was already so fully given by the thought of ver. 23 attached to what precedes by means of ὅτι, that we could not but see here a real logical pleonasm, such as we are not accustomed to meet with in the writings of the concise and sententious Paul. According to Winer, p. 400, ver. 24 is meant to continue and conclude the argument, so that ver. 23 proves the ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ from the *position* of Christ and the husband, while ver. 24 proves it from the *demand* implied in this position, and hence ἀλλά amounts ultimately to the sense: "*but then*, which is the main thing." But even in this way only a continuing δέ, *autem*, and not the adversative ἀλλά, *at*, would be quite in accordance with the thought. When, moreover, it is assumed, with Rückert, Harless, Bleek, that ἀλλά, after the intermediate thought αὐτὸς ὁ σωτ. τ. σ., is used as *breaking off* and leading back to the theme,[4] it is self-evident that the brief clause αὐτὸς ὁ σωτ. τ. σ.—introduced, moreover, only as apposition—has not at all interrupted the development, and consequently has not given occasion for such a leading back to the theme.[5] Hofmann finally takes ἀλλά as repelling a

---

[1] Comp. also Dorville, *ad Charit.* p. 452.

[2] Hom. *Od.* xix. 294 ; Matt. i. 16.

[3] Thomas Aquinas, Semler.

[4] "Uxoris erga maritum officia *similia quodammodo sunt officiis Christianorum erga Christum*," "The duties of a wife towards her husband are in a measure like the duties of Christians towards Christ," Koppe.

[5] Holzhausen (comp. already Chrysostom) has again referred *αὐτός* to the *husband*, who is called *σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος* in comparison with Christ, inasmuch as the being of the wife is conditioned by the husband. Incorrectly, since no reader could refer *αὐτός* to any other subject than to the one immediately preceding, *ὁ Χριστός*, and since it was intelligible to describe the church doubtless, but not the wife, as *τὸ σῶμα* (without further addition). Nor is *σωτήρ* ever employed in the N. T. otherwise than of Christ or God.

[6] Schaefer, *Melet.* p. 84 ; Bernhardy, p. 283.

[7] "Merito et efficaica," "by merit and efficacy," Calovius.

[8] For the view, that hereby a reminder is given to husbands of the fact, which is

---

often forgotten by them, that they (see ver. 29) ought to make their wives truly happy (Erasm., Beza, Grotius, Estius, and others, including Rückert, Meier, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius; comp. also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 134 f.), is inadmissible, since the instructions for husbands begin only with ver. 25. Harless remarks: "Inasmuch as the apostle finds the obedience of marriage, realized in it by the wife, also in the relation of the church to Christ, he shows immediately the ground of this peculiar relation in the manifestation of the gracious power of the Lord by redemption." But in this way the question as to the reason determining this addition is not answered, and the gracious *power* of the Lord is, in fact, not denoted by the simple σωτήρ. Olshausen (so already Piscator) thought that αὐτὸς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ σώμ. had merely the design of setting forth Christ more distinctly in the character of κεφαλή, inasmuch as it designates the church as the σῶμα which He rules. But it is not τοῦ σώματος that has the emphasis; and κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλ., spoken of Christ, needed no elucidation, least of all in *this* Epistle.

[1] So Beza, Grotius, and others, including Matthies, Olshausen, de Wette [Ewald, Braune].

[2] Apollon. Alex. in Beck, *Anecd.* II. p. 518, 839; Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 384; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* v. 14; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 63.

[3] "Argumentorum enarrationem aut aliam cogitationem abrumpit et ad rem ipsam, quae sit agenda, vocat," "It breaks off the reckoning of arguments or other thought, and calls to the subject itself which is to be done," Klotz, *l.c.* p. 5; comp. Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 812; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 78.

[4] See Hartung, *l.c.* II. p. 37.

[5] And *how* would Paul have returned to

possible objection, and to this effect : "*But even where the husband is not this* (namely, one who makes happy, as like Christ he ought to be) *to his wife, that subordination nevertheless remains,*" etc. But in this way the very thought, upon which everything is held to turn, is purely read into the passage. In view of all that has been said, I (and Schenkel agrees with me in this) cannot take αὐτὸς ὁ σωτ. τ. σ. as apposition, but only as an independent proposition, and I understand ἀλλά in its ordinary adversative sense, namely, thus : "*He* for His person, *He* and no other, *is the Saviour of the body ; but* this relation, which belongs exclusively to Himself, does not take away the obligation of obedience on the part of the wives towards their husbands, nay, rather, *as the church obeys Christ, so must also the wives obey their husbands in every respect.*" The right view was already perceived by Calvin, when on account of the adversative ἀλλά he proposed the explanation :[1] "Habet quidem id peculiare Christus, quod est servator ecclesiae, nihilominus sciant mulieres, sibi maritos praeesse, Christi exemplo, utcunque pari gratia non polleant," "It is true that Christ has this peculiarity, that He is the Saviour of the Church ; nevertheless, let the women know that their husbands are over them, according to the example of Christ, however unequal may be the favor they exercise." Comp. also Bengel, who aptly remarks : "Vir autem non est servator uxoris ; in eo Christus excellit ; hinc *sed* sequitur," "The husband, however, is not the Saviour of the wife ; in this Christ excels ; hence *but* follows." . . . What Hofmann objects is quite irrelevant ; for the thought, that Christ is Saviour of the body, is not *superfluous*, but has its significant bearing in the contrast which follows ; and Paul had not to write ἡμῶν instead of τοῦ σώματος with a view to clearness, since Christ was, in fact, just designated as κεφαλή ; consequently nothing was now more natural and clear than the designation of believers by τοῦ σώματος, the *correlative* of κεφαλή. The objection of Reiche, that αὐτός comes in *asyndetically*, can have no weight in the case of Paul especially, and of his brief and terse moral precepts (see immediately ver. 28, and comp. in particular Rom. xii. 9 ff.). — αἱ γυναῖκες] *sc.* ὑποτασσέσθωσαν. See ver. 22. — ἐν παντί] in which case it is presupposed that the commanding on the part of the husbands is in keeping with their position as representing Christ towards the wife. Ὡς εὐσεβέσι νομοθετῶν προστέθεικε τὸ ἐν παντί, "As making rules for the godly, he added the ἐν παντί," Theodoret.

Ver. 25. If the duty of the wives was ὑποτάσσεσθαι τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ, that of the husband is : ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κ.τ.λ., a love, therefore, which is ready to undergo even death out of affection for the wife. "Si omnia rhetorum argumenta in unum conjicias, non tam persuaseris conjugibus dilectionem mutuam, quam hic Paulus," "If you cast all the arguments of orators together, you will not

---

his theme ! He would have said again, in another form, in ver. 24, that which he had just said in ver. 23 ! After so short a clause as αὐτὸς ὁ σωτ. τ. σ., what an un-Pauline diffuseness !

[1] He did not, however, himself give it the preference, but erroneously took ἀλλά as *ceterum*, and in αὐτὸς ὁ σωτ. τ. σ. found the thought : "ita nihil esse mulieri utilius nec magis salubre, quam ut marito subsit," "Nothing is more useful, nor more advantageous to a woman than to be subject to a husband."

persuade husband and wife so effectually to mutual love as Paul does here," Bugenhagen. — *καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδ. κ.τ.λ.*] A practical proof of the *ἠγάπησε*. Comp. ver. 2. *What* giving up is meant (namely, that *unto death*) is obvious of itself here, where no definition is added to *παρέδ.*; Gal. ii. 20; Rom. iv. 25.

Ver. 26. *Aim*, which Christ had in view in giving up Himself for the church, and therewith *continued statement of the pattern of love given by Him.* — *ἵνα αὐτ. ἁγ. κ.τ.λ.*] "*in order to sanctify it, after having cleansed it through the bath of water, by means of the word.*" In His sacrificial death, namely, Christ's intention with regard to His future church had this aim, that, after having by baptism brought about for its members the forgiveness of their pre-Christian sins, He would make it partaker of Christian-moral holiness by means of the gospel. That cleansing is the *negative* side of that, which Christ contemplated with regard to His church in His death, and this sanctification by means of the gospel constantly influencing the baptized is the *positive* side; the former the *antecedens*, "antecedent," the latter the *consequens*, "consequent;" and both are caused by the *atoning death*, which is the *causa meritoria*, "meritorious cause," of the forgiveness of sins brought about by means of baptism, and the *contents* of the gospel as the word of the cross. The sanctifying influence of the latter is the efficacy of the Holy Spirit, who works by means of the gospel (vi. 17); but the Holy Spirit is subject to Christ (2 Cor. iii. 18), and Christ also communicates Himself in the Spirit to men's hearts (Rom. viii. 9 f.); hence it is said with justice that *Christ* sanctifies the church through the word (comp. also ii. 21), in which case it is self-evident to the Christian consciousness that the operative principle therein is the Spirit operating by means of the word. The Vulgate translates *καθαρ.* *mundans*, "cleansing," and Zanchius says: "*modum exprimit*, quo eam sanctificet," "he expresses the mode, whereby he sanctifies it." So, too, Harless, who holds *ἁγιάσῃ* and *καθαρίσας* not to be different notions, but the latter to be a more precise definition of the former, which signifies *purum reddere a culpa peccati*, "to render pure from the guilt of sin." The *aorist* participle would not be opposed to this view, because it could express that which is coincident in point of time with *ἁγιάσῃ* (see on i. 9); but it is opposed by the fact that *ἐν ῥήματι* cannot be joined to *καθαρίσας* (see below), but sanctification by the word must of necessity be something other than the cleansing by baptism, as also at 1 Cor. vi. 11 (comp. Acts ii. 38, xxii. 16), the cleansing by means of baptism (*ἀπελούσασθε*) precedes the sanctification (*ἡγιάσθητε*).[1] Comp. Tit. iii. 5–7.[2] — *τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ* ὕδατος] (genitive *materiae*, "of material") denotes the *well-known* bath of water κατ' ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminently," which is administered by *baptism*. We have thus here not simply an *allusion* to baptism,[1] but a *designation* of the same (comp. Tit. iii. 5 ; 1 Cor. vi. 11), and an allusion to the bath of the bride before the wedding-day ; see on ver. 27. — ἐν ῥήματι] belongs to ἁγιάσῃ (comp. John xvii. 17), but is not placed immediately after it, because the two verbal definitions ἁγιάσῃ and καθαρίσας, and again the two instrumental definitions τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος and ἐν ῥήματι, are intended to stand together, whereby the structure of the discourse is arranged of set purpose conformably to the sense and with emphatic distinctness. ῥῆμα is the *gospel*, τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως, Rom. x. 8, comp. 17, Eph. vi. 17, Heb. vi. 5, and here stands without an article, because, denoting the word κατ' ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminently," it could be treated like a *proper noun*, such as νόμος, χάρις, and the like. The connecting of ἐν ῥήμ. with ἁγιάσῃ is followed also by Jerome, Castalio, Calovius, Morus, Rosenmüller, Winer, p. 125, Rückert, Bisping, Bleek.[2] Others, however, join it to τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος,[3] in which case they understand by ῥῆμα either the *baptismal formula*,[4] or the *divine precept*,[5] or the *divine promise*,[6] or "lavacro *invocatione divini nominis* efficaci," "the laver efficacious by the invocation of the divine name,"[7] or the *gospel*,[8] or the *divine power and efficacy in the word of truth*, so that ἐν ῥήματι is equivalent to ἐν πνεύματι.[9] But all these explanations break down in presence of the fact, that we should need to read τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος τῷ, or τοῦ ἐν ῥήμ., since neither τὸ λουτρόν nor τὸ ὕδωρ admits of being joined into unity of idea with ἐν ῥήματι ;[10] as well as of the fact, that the special interpretations of ῥῆμα, except that of *gospel*, are purely invented. Others have combined ἐν ῥήμ. with καθαρίσας,[11] in which case likewise ἐν ῥήμ. has been explained by some of the words of the institution and their promise,[12] by others of the gospel,[13] while Harless trans-

---

[1] In *Act. Thom.* p. 40 f.: κατάμιξον αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν σὴν ποίμνην καθαρίσας αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ σῷ λουτρῷ κ.τ.λ., "Mingle them with thy fold, having cleansed them in thy laver," the act of the κατάμιξον κ.τ.λ., is (in opposition to Harless) conceived of as immediately *subsequent to* the act of the καθαρίσας κ.τ.λ. The Fathers, too, separate the cleansing and the sanctifying of the person who receives baptism. So *e.g.*, Justin Martyr, *de resurrect.* in Grabe, *Spicil.* II. p. 189. Tertull. *de resurrect.* 8: "Caro abluitur, ut anima *emaculetur*; care ungitur, ut anima *consecretur*," "The flesh is washed, in order that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed that the soul may be consecrated." Cypr. *ad Donat. de gratia*, p. 3: "Undae genitalis auxilio *superioris aevi labe detersa* in expiatum pectus serenum desuper se lumen infudit," "By the aid of the genital wave, *the stain of the former life being cleansed*, the light from above infuses itself into the expiated breast," etc.

[2] Hofmann, II. 2, p. 135, would, in opposi-

---

tion to the simple and clear course of the representation, combine καϑαρίσας κ.τ.λ. with the following ἵνα παραστήσῃ, but for the invalid reason that afterwards τὴν ἐκκλησιαν is repeated, and not the mere αὐτήν used. As if Paul might not have used the mere αὐτήν even with this combination! And how often do all writers repeat the noun with emphasis (so here), or for the sake of perspicuity, instead of using the pronoun! Comp. on iv. 16.

[1] Grotius, Homberg.

[2] Against de Wette's objections is to be observed, (1) that, according to Rom. x. 8, 17, ῥῆμα can certainly be taken as the gospel ; (2) that sanctification is wrought indeed through the *Spirit*, but the Spirit is mediated through the gospel, Gal. iii. 5 ; (3) that the order of the words is not *forced*, but *purposely chosen*.

[3] Luther: "by the water-bath in the word."

[4] Chrysostom: ἐν ῥήματι ποίῳ; ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, "In what word? In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" comp. Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Ambrosiaster, Menochius, Calovius, Flatt, de Wette, and others.

[5] "Lavationem . . . nitentem divino mandato," "a washing resting upon the divine command," Storr.

[6] "Qua vis et usus signi explicatur," "whereby the force and use of the sign are explained," Calvin; comp. Michaelis, Knapp, Tychsen.

[7] Erasmus.

[8] Augustine, Estius, Flatt, Holzhausen, and others.

[9] Olshausen.

[10] Such as αἱ ἐντολαὶ ἐν δόγμασι, ii. 15, or ἡ πίστις ἐν Χρ., or the like.

[11] Syriac, which inserts καί before ἐν ῥήμ; Bengel, Baumgarten, Matthies, Harless, Baumgarten-Crusius, Hofmann; perhaps also Beza and Calvin ; Meier is quite indistinct.

[12] Baumgarten.

[13] Syriac, Bengel: "in verbo est vis mundifica, et haec exseritur per lavacrum,"

lates : "*by way of utterance, by way of promise*," which can refer only to the promise given with the *institution ;* and Hofmann : *with a word*, which is alleged to mean : *so that He uttered His effective will, that it should become clean.* But it is altogether arbitrary, since *καθαρίσας* already has a modal definition, to attach *ἐν ῥήματι* thereto in addition, and on the other hand to leave *ἁγιάσῃ* isolated, although *ἐν ῥήμ. can* very suitably as regards sense be attached to *ἁγιάσῃ* ; further, that which cleanses, *i.e.*, that which not merely symbolically represents the cleansing,[1] but does away with the pre-Christian guilt of sin, is *baptism*,[2] comp. also 1 Pet. iii. 21, Acts ii. 38, xxii. 16, and not the *ῥῆμα*, whether we understand thereby the gospel or the words of the institution ; lastly, the sense by "way of promise" Paul would have known how to express otherwise than in so indefinite and enigmatic a manner, such as, possibly, by *κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν*, Gal. iii. 29 ; as, indeed, also the sense understood by Hofmann could not have been more indistinctly conveyed than by the bare *ἐν ῥήματι*.[3] Grotius combines *ἐν ῥήματι* with *καθαρ.*, but supplies *ὡς* before *ἐν τῷ λουτρῷ* : "*verbo suo quasi balneo*," "by his word as a bath." As if one could simply thus *supply ὡς* ! Lastly, Koppe is quite wrong in holding that *ἐν ῥήματι ἵνα* is in accordance with the Hebrew על דבר אשר, "upon the word which," nothing more than the bare *ἵνα*. Not even the LXX. have translated thus barbarously ! [See Note LV., p. 525 seq.]

Ver. 27. *Aim* of the *ἁγιάσῃ ἐν ῥήματι*, and so *final aim* of the *ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς*, to be realized *at the Parousia*. Comp. on 2 Cor. xi. 2. *παραστήσῃ* is already rightly referred to the time of the *consummatio saeculi*, "consummation of the world," by Augustine, Jerome, Primasius, Thomas, Beza, Estius, Calovius, and others, including Flatt, Rückert, de Wette, Schenkel, Bleek ; while the Greek Fathers, Lyra, Cajetanus, Bucer, Wolf, Bengel, and others, including Harless and Hofmann, p. 136, think of an act of Christ in the *αἰὼν οὗτος*, "this world," and many others do not at all declare their views with regard to the time. But if *ἵνα παραστ. κ.τ.λ.* is not to apply to the time of the Parousia, it must either be taken as the design of the *καθαρίσας*,[4] or as a parallel to *ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ*.[5] The former is not admissible, because *ἐν ῥήματι*, which itself belongs to *ἁγιάσῃ* (see on ver. 26), stands between ; nor yet is the latter, because *ἁγιάσῃ* does not denote the same thing with *καθαρίσας* (see on ver. 26), but the making holy through the word ; and this making holy cannot from its nature be parallel to the *momentary* act of *presenting* of the church as a glorious and spotless one, but can only be antecedent, so

---

"in the word is the cleansing force, and this is exerted through the laver," comp. Matthies and Baumgarten-Crusius, as also Schenkel.

[1] Schenkel.

[2] This also in opposition to Theile in Winer's *Exeget. Stud.* p. 187 : *ἐν ῥήματι* is a sort of correction of *τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος*.

[3] What Hofmann, II. 2, p. 191, oddly enough adduces by way of elucidation: "As the husband by the word, which expresses his will to make a woman his wife, takes away from her the reproach of her virgin state (comp. Isa. iv. 1 ; 1 Cor. vii. 36), so has Christ done for the church," drags in something entirely *foreign* to the matter, and, indeed, something very *unsuitable*, as though the church were thought of as *παρθένος ὑπέρακμος* !

[4] Bengel.

[5] Harless.

that this presentation must be the final result of the sanctifying which has already taken place through the word. — παραστήσῃ] *might set forth*, *present*, *coram sisteret*, namely, as His bride. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 2. The view of Harless, that the church is conceived of not as bride, but as spotless *offering* (on παραστ. comp. Rom. xii. 1), is opposed to the context, and incorrect also on account of ἑαυτῷ, by which, in fact, there would result the conception that Christ presents the offering *to Himself*. No, the union of Christ with His Church at the Parousia, in order to confer upon it Messianic blessedness, is conceived of by Paul (as also by Christ Himself, Matt. xxv. 1 ff., comp. Rev. xix. 7 ff.; see also John iii. 29) under the figure of the bringing home of a bride, wherein Christ appears as the bridegroom and *sets forth* the bride, *i.e.*, His church, as a spotless virgin (the bodily purity is a representation of the ethical) before Himself, after He has already in the αἰὼν οὗτος, "this world," cleansed it by the bath of baptism (*i.e.*, blotted out the pre-Christian guilt of the church) and sanctified it through His word. To deny the reference of καθαρίσας κ.τ.λ. and of ver. 27 to the circumstances of a wedding, and particularly the allusion to the bath to be taken by the bride before the wedding-day,[1] is an over-refinement of taste at variance with the context.[2]—The *presentation* in our passage was referred by Kahnis[3] to the *Lord's Supper*, an application which is warranted neither by the context nor by the analogy of 2 Cor. xi. 2 and Matt. xxv. — αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ] so that what takes place is not therefore as in the case of the bringing home of actual brides by others, but *Christ Himself*, as He gave *Himself* to sanctify it, etc., presents the church as bride *to Himself* at His Parousia, and indeed as ἔνδοξον, in glorious beauty (Luke vii. 25; Isa. xxii. 18, *al.*), which is with emphasis placed before τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, and subsequently receives by means of μὴ ἔχουσαν κ.τ.λ. a detached, more precise negative definition specially to be brought into prominence.[4] — σπῖλον] *maculam*, comp. 2 Pet. ii. 13, a word of the later age of Greek, instead of the Attic κηλίς.[5] In the *figure* is meant a *corporeal* blemish, but in the *reality* a *moral* defilement. The same is the case with ῥυτίδα, *rugam*, "wrinkle," which occurs only here in the N. T., but often in the classical writers, not in the LXX. or Apocrypha. Special distinctions as to what is intended by the two figures are arbitrary. So *e.g.* Estius:[6] σπῖλ. signifies *deformitas operis*, "deformity of work," and ῥυτ. *duplicitas intentionis*, "duplicity of intention;" Grotius: the former applies to the *carere vitiis*, "to lack faults," the latter to the *vegetos semper esse*, "always to be vigorous," for good (because wrinkles are characteristic of age). — ἤ τι τῶν τοιούτων] which belongs to the category of such things, of that which disfigures, like spots and wrinkles. — ἀλλ’ ἵνα ᾖ κ.τ.λ.] change of the construction, instead of ἀλλ’ οὖσαν κ.τ.λ., as if ἵνα μὴ ἔχῃ κ.τ.λ. had been said before. Versatility of the Greek mode of thought and expression.[1] — ἁγία] the thing signified in place of the figure, which would be more congruously expressed by ἁγνή (2 Cor. xi. 2). — ἄμωμος] i. 4. Comp. Cant. iv. 7. Grotius, at variance with the context, holds that Paul had in the case of both expressions thought of: "quales *victimae* esse debebant in V. T.," "as victims had to be in the O. T."

---

[1] Harless, Baumgarten-Crusius, Hofmann, and others.

[2] It is certainly obvious that this bathing in the case of an actual bride was not the business of the *bridegroom* (as Hofmann objects); but in the case of the *church* conceived as the bride the cleansing by the bath of baptism is the act of the bridegroom (who in fact does not cause the bride, cleansed and sanctified by him, to be presented by others, but presents her to himself), and thus Paul has drawn the *figure itself* in accordance with the state of matters in the reality *delineated*, as indeed frequently figures are modified in accordance with the thing to be represented (comp. on Matt. xxv. 1; Gal. iv. 19). If we press the figures beyond the *tertium comparationis*, no one is any longer appropriate. — On the λουτρὸν νυμφικόν, "bridal laver" (at which καθαρ. τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος here glances), comp. specially Bos, *Exercitt.* p. 185 f.; Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § 31. 6; Becker, *Charicles*, ii. p. 460 ff.; as also Buxtorf, *Synag.* p. 626.

[3] *Abendm.* p. 144.

[4] With regard to αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ, comp. 2 Cor. i. 9; Xen. *Mem.* iii. 5. 11; Thucyd. vi. 40. 3; Krüger, § 51. 2. 12.

[5] See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 28.

[6] After Augustine.

Ver. 28. Οὕτως] To refer this, with Meier and Baumgarten-Crusius, as also de Wette is disposed to do, to the following ὡς,[2] might, doubtless, be admissible in itself (see on 1 Cor. iv. 1), but is here quite out of place; because οὕτως would then have an undue emphasis, and the declaration would stand without any inner connection with that which precedes. It relates to what is said from καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστός, ver. 25 onwards to ver. 27, and is equivalent to: *in accordance with this relation, in keeping with this holy love of Christ for the church.*[3] We may add that Zanchius, who is followed by Estius and Harless,[4] is in error in saying, "digressus non nihil ad *mysterium*, nunc ad *institutum* redit," "the digression recurs sometimes to the *mystery*, but now to the ordinance." There was no digression in what precedes, but a delineation of the love of Christ serving as an example for the husbands. — ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα] not: *like* their own bodies,[5] but: *as* their own bodies. For Christ loved the church not *like* His body, but *as* His body, which the church *is* and He its head, ver. 23. So is also the husband head of the wife, and he is to love the wife *as* his body—which conception, however, does not present the Gnostic notion of the πλήρωμα,[6] but, on the contrary, comp. 1 Cor. xi. 3. Schoettgen, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Meier, and others make ὡς τὰ ἑαυτ. σώματα mean nothing more than: *like themselves;* but this is in itself quite arbitrary and without support from linguistic usage, and also utterly inappropriate to the example of Christ, since we certainly cannot say of Christ that He loved the church *like Himself!* In the Rabbinical passages, too, as *Sanhedr.* f. 76, 2: "qui uxorem amat *ut corpus suum*," "who loves his wife as his body," etc., this *ut corpus suum*, "as his body," is to be taken literally, and that in accordance with the mode of regarding man and wife as one flesh. We may add that Paul does not by means of ὡς τ. ἑαυτ. σώμ. pass over into *another figure*, or even to another *view* of the subject,[1] but already, in the preceding description of the love of Christ to the church, his conception has been that Christ loves the church, His bride, *as his body*, which conception he now first, in the application, definitely indicates, and in vv. 29–31 more particularly elucidates. — ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἑαυτὸν ἀγαπᾷ] From the duty of loving their own wives ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα, results—inasmuch as in fact according to this the wife belongs essentially to the proper self of the husband as such—the proposition of conjugal ethics, *that the love of one's own wife is love of oneself.* This proposition Paul lays down, in order to treat it more in detail, vv. 29–32, and finally repeat it in the form of a direct precept in ver. 33.

---

[1] See, in general, Matthiae, p. 1527 f.; Winer, p. 509; Buttmann, *neutest. Gr.* p. 208 [E. T. 241].

[2] Estius likewise would have it so understood, unless οὕτως καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες ὀφείλουσιν be read; which, however, is really to be read, see the critical remarks.

[3] Comp. Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* 1. 39; Herm. *ad Viger.* p. 793.

[4] Who thinks that Paul is only resuming the simple injunction of ver. 25, with the expansion ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα. Certainly the main point of the precept, ver. 28, lies in those words; but this whole precept is by means of οὕτως *grounded* on what is said from καθὼς κ. ὁ Χρ., ver. 25, onward.

[5] Meier; comp. also Grotius, who here brings in the entirely heterogeneous comparison: "Sicuti corpus est instrumentum animi, ita uxor est instrumentum viri ad res domesticas, ad quaerendos liberos," "As the body is the instrument of the mind, so the wife is the instrument of the husband for domestic affairs, for obtaining children."

[6] Baur.

Ver. 29. Γάρ] *assigns the reason of what immediately precedes*, and that so, that this statement of the reason is intended to *impel* to the exercise of the self-love involved in the love to the wife. The connection of the thoughts, namely, is this : "He who loves his own wife, loves himself ; for, if he did not love her, he would hate *his own flesh*, which is so repugnant to nature that no one has ever yet done it, but rather every one does the opposite, as also *Christ*—and that gives to this natural relation the highest consecration—acts with regard to the church, because this constitutes the members of His body." — ποτέ] *ever*, not, as Mayerhoff would take it:[2] *formerly*, in the heathen state, the contrast to which is supposed to be : but possibly *now*, under the influence of an asceticism directed against marriage—a view, which the *present tenses* that follow ought to have precluded. — τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα] σάρξ is here indifferent[3] without the conception of what is sinful.[4] Paul might have written σῶμα instead,[5] but chose σάρκα, because the idea of the μία σάρξ, which is realized in the married state, is already (see ver. 21) present to his mind. — ἀλλ'] *sc.* ἕκαστος.[6] — ἐκτρέφει] *enutrit*, "nourishes." The compound form denotes the development that is brought about by the nourishing ; comp. vi. 4.[7] — θάλπει] *makes it warm*, *fovet* (Vulgate) ; Goth : "*varmeith.*" It is thus to be taken in its *proper* signification.[8] Bengel aptly says : "id spectat amictum," "this refers to clothing, as nourishing does to food." The *usual* interpretation is : "*he fosters it*," Luther. Without support from linguistic usage. — It is, we may add, self-evident that οὐδεὶς . . . αὐτήν expresses a proposition of experience, the correctness of which holds as a general rule, and is not set aside by exceptional cases. The *crucifying of the flesh*, however, in Gal. v. 24, has regard to the *sinful* σάρξ. — καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χρ. τὴν ἐκκλησ.] *sc.* ἐκτρέφει καὶ θάλπει, which is here, of course, to be interpreted metaphorically of the loving operation of Christ for the salvation of His church, whose collective *prosperity* He carefully promotes. To bring out by interpretation specially two elements[1] is arbitrary. According to Kahnis,[2] Christ nourishes the church as His body *by the communication of His body in the Supper.* But apart from the fact that *θάλπει* does not suit this, there is no mention *at all* of the Lord's Supper in the whole connection. Comp. on *παραστ.*, ver. 27, and see on ver. 30 ff. The *καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χρ. τὴν ἐκκλ.* is the sacred refrain of the whole Christian ethics of marriage: comp. vv. 23, 25.

---

[1] Rückert.

[2] *Koloss.* p. 144.

[3] Comp. Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 425.

[4] See also Ernesti, *Urspr. d. Sünde*, I. p. 54.

[5] Curtius, vii. 1 : "corporibus nostris, quae utique non odimus," "with our bodies, which assuredly we do not hate ;" Seneca, *Ep.* 14 : "fateor insitam nobis esse corporis nostri caritatem," "I confess that love of our body is implanted in us."

[6] See Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 366 D ; *ad Symp.* p. 192 E.

[7] See the passages in Wetstein.

[8] Hom. *Odyss.* xxi. 179, 184, 246 ; Xen. *Cyr.* v. 1. 11 ; Soph. *Phil.* 38 ; also Theocr. xiv. 38 ; Deut. xxii. 6 ; Job xxxix. 14 ; 1 Thess. ii. 8.

Ver. 30. Reason why Christ *ἐκτρέφει καὶ θάλπει* the church: *because we are members of His body.* *μέλη* is prefixed with emphasis; for we are not an *accidens*, "accident," but *integral parts* of His body. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 27. — *ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ κ. ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ*] More precise definition of the *μέλη τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ* just said, in order to express this relation as strongly as possible: (proceeding) *from His flesh and from His bones.* This form of expression is a reminiscence of Gen. ii. 23,[3] where Adam expresses the origin of Eve out of his bones and out of his flesh,[4]—to which origin the derivative relation of Christians to Christ is analogous, of course not physically, but in the spiritual, mystical sense, *inasmuch as the Christian existence as such—the specific being and spiritual nature of Christians—proceeds from Christ, has in Christ its principle of origination*, as in a physical manner Eve proceeded from Adam. The at any rate non-literal expressions are not intended to bear minuter interpretation. They do not affirm that believers are produced and taken out of Christ's glorified body,[5] which is already forbidden by the expression "flesh and bones." Rather is the same thing intended—only brought, in accordance with the connection, into the definite sensuously genetic form of presentation suggested by Gen. *l.c.*—which elsewhere is denoted by *καινὴ κτίσις* (2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15), as well as by *ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός* (Gal. ii. 20), by *Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε* (Gal. iii. 27), by the relation of the *ἓν πνεῦμα εἶναι* to Christ (1 Cor. vi. 17), and in general by the expressions setting forth the Christian *παλιγγενεσία*.[6] Comp. the *κοινωνὸν γίνεσθαι θείας φύσεως*, 2 Pet. i. 4. With various modifications it has been explained of the *spiritual origination from Christ* already by Chrysostom (who understood the regeneration by baptism), Ambrosiaster, Theodoret, Oecumenius,[7] Theophylact, Erasmus, Beza, Vorstius,[8] Calvin ("qui spiritus sui virtute nos in corpus suum inserit, ut vitam ex eo hauriamus," "who by the virtue of His Spirit inserts us into His body, that we may derive life from Him"), Calovius, Bengel, Matthies, de Wette,[1] Hofmann, Reiche, and others; while, withal, Koppe (so also Meier) thought only *arctissimam quamlibet conjunctionem*, "a most intimate union," to be denoted, whereby justice is not done to the genetic signification of the ἐκ. Others explained it: *in so far as we have the same human nature as He*. So Irenaeus, Jerome, Augustine, Thomas, Michaelis; comp. also Stolz and Rosenmüller. Decidedly erroneous, partly because Paul could not in this sense say: "we are of Christ's flesh and bone," but only the converse: "Christ is of our flesh and bone" (Rom. i. 3, ix. 5; John i. 14); partly because the element of having like nature with Christ would apply not merely to Christians, but to men as such generally. Others refer it to the *crucifixion of Christ*: "ex carne ejus et ossibus *crucifixis*, i.e., ex passione ejus predicata et credita ortum habuit ecclesia," "from his flesh and crucified bones, *i.e.*, from his passion preached and believed, the church has its origin," Grotius.[2] But the *crucifixis*, "crucified," is purely imported, and could the less be guessed here, inasmuch as from the words the history of Adam and Eve inevitably came to be recalled; and there is nothing to remind us[3] of the "martyr-stake of the cross," upon which Christ "*gave up*" His flesh and bones "and suffered them *to be broken*" (? see John xix. 33, 36). Others, finally, have explained it *of the real communion with the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper*. So recently,[4] in addition to Kahnis and Thomasius,[5] also Harless and Olshausen, the latter of whom says: "it is the self-communication of His divine-human nature, by which Christ makes us to be His flesh and bone; He gives His people His flesh to eat and His blood to drink." But not even the *semblance* of a plea for explaining it of the Supper lies in the words; since Paul has not written καὶ ἐκ τῶν αἵματος αὐτοῦ, which would have been *specific* in the case of the Supper, but καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ὀστέων αὐτοῦ! Rückert has renounced any attempt at explanation, and doubts whether Paul himself thought of anything definite in the words. A very needless *despair* of exegesis! [See Note LVI., p. 526.]

---

[1] Grotius: "*nutrit* eam verbo et Spiritu, *vestit* virtutibus," "nourishes it with His word and Spirit; clothes it with virtues."

[2] *Abendm.* p. 143 f.

[3] This reminiscence the more readily suggested itself to the apostle, not only in general, because he was wont to think of Christ as the second Adam (Rom. v. 12 ff.), but also specially because he was just treating of the subject of *marriage*.

[4] That Paul should not prefix *ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων*, as in Gen. ii. 23, but *ἐκ τῆς σαρκός*, was quite naturally suggested to him by ver. 29. The explanation of Bengel is arbitrary and far-fetched.

[5] Gess, *Person Christi*, p. 274 ff.; comp. Bisping.

[6] Philo also, p. 1094, applies the words of Gen. *l.c.* to a *spiritual* relation—to the relation of the soul to God. If the soul were better and more like God, it would be able to make use of those words, because, namely, it *οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀλλοτρία αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ σφόδρα οἰκεῖα*, "is not foreign to Him, but emphatically His own."

[7] *ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ, καθὸ ἀπαρχὴ ἡμῶν ἐστι τῆς δευτέρας πλάσεως, ὥσπερ ἐκ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ διὰ τὴν πρώτην*, "Of Him, as He is our beginning of the second creation, as Adam was by the first."

[8] "Spirituali tantum ratione ex ipso

Ver. 31. Not a *citation* from Gen. ii. 24, but (comp. vi. 2) Paul makes these words of Scripture, which as such were well known to the readers, his own, while the deviations from the LXX. are unimportant and make no difference to the sense. What, however, is spoken, Gen. *l.c.*, of the union of husband and wife, Paul applies by typical inrerpretation to the coming

---

Christo quasi procreatos esse," "Only in a spiritual manner, as if they were procreated from Christ Himself."

[1] Who, however, in the second edition, regards the words as spurious.

[2] Comp. already Cajetanus, as also Zanchius, Zachariae, Schenkel, having reference to John vi. 51 f., xiv. 18 ff.

[3] In opposition to Schenkel.

[4] Many of the older expositors, following Theodoret and Theophylact, at least mixed up the Supper in various ways in their interpretation. So Beza and Calvin say that it is *obsignatio et symbolum*, "a sealing and symbol," of the mystic fellowship with Christ here meant. Grotius found an *allusion* to the Supper; while, on the other hand, Calovius maintained that we were *ex Christo*, "of Christ," not only by regeneration, but also by the communication of His body and blood in the Lord's Supper.

[5] III. 2, p. 73.

(*future:* καταλείψει κ.τ.λ.) union of Christ with the church (see ver. 32), a union which shall take place at the Parousia, up to which time the church is the *bride* of Christ, and at which time it is then nuptially joined with Him (see on ver. 27),—and so the apostle expresses this antitype of the conjugal union in the hallowed words of Scripture, in which the type, the marriage union in the proper sense, is expressed. We have accordingly to explain it thus: *For this reason*, because we are Christ's members, of His flesh and of His bone, *shall a man* (*i.e.*, antitypically, *Christ*, at the Parousia) *leave father and mother* (*i.e.*, according to the mystic interpretation of the apostle: He will leave His seat at the right hand of God) *and be united with his wife* (with the church), *and* (and then) *the two* (the man and the wife, *i.e.*, Christ who has descended and the church) *shall be one flesh* (form one ethical person, as married persons by virtue of bodily union, become a physical unity). Those expositors who, in keeping with the original sense of Gen. *l.c.*, take the words of *actual marriage*,[1] have against them as well the ἀντὶ τούτου, which cannot be referred without arbitrariness to anything else than what immediately precedes, as also the *future* expression, which (as also in Gen. *l.c.*) must denote something yet to come; and not less the statement of Paul Himself, ver. 32, according to which ἄνθρωπος *must be* interpreted of *Christ*, and τὴν γυναῖκα of the *church*, not merely *perhaps*[2] is to be so interpreted. Hofmann likewise[3] understands it of real marriage, and sees all difficulties vanish if we more closely connect ver. 32 with ver. 31, so that τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο sums up the Old Testament passage itself and makes this the subject, and then the sense is: "*That, as the passage affirms, the marriage communion is the most intimate of all communions for this reason, because the wife proceeds from the husband—this mystery, which was foreign to the Gentiles, is great. It is a highly significant mystery of the order laid down by the creation, a most important revelation of the divine counsel in this domain, which the apostle interprets as applying to Christ and the church, because marriage in this respect has its higher counterpart in the domain of redemption, but without excluding its validity also for the married as regards their relation regulated by the creation.*" This view is incorrect, for the very reason that to make τὸ μυστήριον be said in reference to the *Gentiles* is quite foreign to, and remote from, the connection; because, further, Paul must have written ἐγὼ δὲ νῦν λέγω; because λέγω does not mean "I say *of* it," but "I say *it*," *i.e.*, I *interpret* it; because ἀντὶ τούτου would remain entirely out of connection with that which precedes, and thus the passage of Scripture would make its appearance quite abruptly; because, if the reader was to understand the whole passage of Scripture as the subject, summed up in τὸ μυστήρ. τοῦτο, of what follows, the apostle must have indicated this, in order to be intelligible, by something like τὸ δὲ ἀντὶ τούτου κ.τ.λ., μυστήριον μέγα ἐστίν; and because, finally, the validity of the fundamental law of marriage, ver. 31, for married persons is so entirely self-evident, that a quite unsuitable thought ("but without excluding," etc.) is attributed to the πλήν of ver. 33. — Those, further, *who explain it of Christ and the church*, as Hunnius, Balduin, Grotius, Bengel, Michaelis, and others, are mistaken in believing the connection with Christ already existing in the *present* αἰών as that which is meant ; inasmuch as in the καταλείψει τὸν πατ. κ. τ. μητ. they think of the *incarnation*,[1] or generally of the fact that "Christus nihil tam carum habuit, quod non nostri causa abdicaverit," "Christ held nothing so dear as not to have abdicated it for our sake,"[2] or even of the separation of Christ from His nation[3] or from the synagogue ;[4] while Harless and Olshausen pass over καταλείψει τὸν πατέρα κ.τ.λ. without more precise explanation, as unessential to the connection and aim, and regard only καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δ. εἰς σ. μ. as the main point, explaining it of the *Lord's Supper*.[5] But the whole reference to the *already present* connection with Christ is incorrect, because *this* connection was just before expressed in the present form by μέλη ἐσμὲν κ.τ.λ., but now upon this present relation is based the setting in of a future one (καταλείψει κ.τ.λ. ; observe the *future* forms), and that by ἀντὶ τούτου, quite as in Gen. ii. 24 by means of ἕνεκεν τούτου the *future* relation of marriage is deduced from the then existing relation of Adam and Eve. These expositors, besides, overlook the fact that in the αἰὼν οὗτος, "this world," Christ is not yet *husband*, but until the Parousia still *bridegroom* of the church (ver. 27), which He only at the Parousia presents to Himself as a purified and sanctified bride for nuptial union. Moreover, the setting aside of the whole portion καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατ. κ.τ.λ., on the part of Harless and Olshausen, is a purely arbitrary proceeding. — ἀντὶ τούτου] See Winer, p. 326. It is distinguished from the ἕνεκεν τούτου in the LXX. only by its placing the cause and the fact thereby conditioned in comparison with each other according to the conception of requital (*for this*).[1] The *reference* of ἀντὶ τούτου, with regard to which many are entirely silent, can be found only in ver. 30 : because our relation to Christ is *this*. See above. *Other* references, as those of Estius : "quia mulier formata est ex ossibus et carne viri," "because the woman was formed of the man's flesh and bones," and Holzhausen : "because the man, in loving his wife, loves himself,"[2] are forced just because of their taking ver. 31 not according to its mystic reference, but of real marriage. — ἄνθρωπος] *a human being*, *i.e.*, according to the context, a *man*,[3] by which, however, according to the mystical interpretation of the apostle, *Christ* is antitypically to be understood. — καὶ τὴν μητέρα] is doubtless taken up along with the rest as a constituent part of the words of Adam, but is *not destined for a special exposition* in the typical reference of the passage to Christ, since καταλείψει τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ can, in accordance with that typical reference, only apply to the *descending of Christ from the right hand of God*, which will ensue at the Parousia. Then the σύνθρονος of the Father comes down to earth, to wed Himself (Matt. xxv. 1) to the church, the bride, 2 Cor. xi. 2.

---

[1] So most expositors, including Matthies, Meier, Schenkel, Bleek, Rückert, who, however, here too despairs of more precise explanation, as the passage stands forth in an abrupt form merely as a hint thrown out for the more initiated.

[2] Reiche.

[3] II. 2, p. 139.

---

[1] "Etiam Christus patrem quasi reliquit," "Christ also, as it were, left His Father," Bengel.

[2] Grotius.

[3] Michaelis.

[4] Bisping.

[5] What in marriage the fleshly union is, that in the connection of the church with Christ the substantial union by means of the Supper is alleged to be! "*As man and wife are indeed always one in love, but in the elements of conjugal union, in which the specific nature of marriage consists, become in a special sense one flesh ; so is also the church as a whole, and each congregation, like each soul in it, always one spirit with Christ, the Head of the body ; but in the elements of the sacred Supper the believing soul celebrates in a very special sense the union with its Saviour, in that it takes up into itself His flesh and blood, and therewith the germ of the immortal body.*" This fanciful view of Olshausen is without any warrant in the context, and at variance with the future καταλείψει, which must—and that indeed according to Gen. ii.—express something *not yet accomplished*, but only *to be expected in the future*. Moreover, the "*leaving*," etc., does not at all suit the conception of the communion of Christ with believers in the Supper, and least of all the orthodox Lutheran conception of ubiquity. [See above, Note XIV.] Nevertheless Kahnis (*Abendm.* p. 144) has entirely acceded to the view of Olshausen. He objects to the explanation of the union of Christ with the church at the *Parousia*, that this union cannot possibly be thought of as "a sacrificial renunciation, on the part of Christ, of His heavenly glory." But the matter is neither so thought of nor so represented. That which is meant by καταλείψει, the coming again of Christ from heaven, will—and this was well known to the believing consciousness of every reader—take place not *without* His heavenly glory, but *with* that glory ; and by the union, which is expressed in the typical representation προσκολληθήσεται κ.τ.λ., the συνδοξασθῆναι of the believers will then be accomplished. Comp. Col. iii. 4.

Ver. 32. For the understanding of ver. 31 in the sense of the apostle an exegetical gloss was necessary, which is here given : *This mystery is great*, is important and exalted in its contents, *but I say it*, adduce it (namely, this mystery, by which is meant just the declaration of Gen. ii. 24), *in reference to Christ and the church*. — τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο] So Paul terms those Old Testament words just employed by him, in so far as they have a hidden meaning not recognized without divine enlightenment.[4] — ἐγὼ δέ] ἐγώ, which Holzhausen even declares to be superfluous, has emphasis : *I*, *however* (δέ metabatic), opposed to the possible interpretations which might be given to the mysterious utterance.[5] — εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν] so that we have thus under ἄνθρωπος to understand *Christ*, and under ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ the *church*. This has been rightly discerned already by the Fathers,[6] only they should not have thought of the coming of Christ in the flesh,[7] but of the Parousia. See on ver. 31. Lastly, it is worthy of notice simply under a historical point of view, that Roman Catholics,[8] on the ground of the Vulgate, which translates μυστήριον by *sacramentum*, proved from our passage[9] that marriage is a sacrament. It is not this that is conveyed in the passage, as indeed in general marriage "non habet a Christo *institutionem* sacramentalem, non *formam*, non *materiam*, non *finem* sacramentalem," "has from Christ neither a sacramental *institution*, nor *form*, nor *substance*, nor *end*,"[10] but it is rather the sacredly ideal and deeply moral character, which is forever assured to marriage by this typical significance in the Christian view. We may add that monogamy is *presupposed* as self-evident, but does not form the *set purpose* of the passage, which would be purely *imported.*[1]

---

[1] Comp. ἀνθ' ὧν, and see Matthiae, p. 1327 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 170.

[2] Comp. Meier and Matthies.

[3] Without on that account ἄνθρωπος standing for ἀνήρ, see Fritzsche, *ad Matt.* p. 593.

[4] With the Rabbins, too, the formula *mysterium magnum*, "a great mystery" (*Jalkut. Rub.* f. 59, 4: דא רזא יקירא) is very common. See Schoettgen, *Horae*, p. 783 f.

[5] Later Rabbinico-mystical interpretations of marriage may be seen in Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 784. Philo, p. 1096, allegorizes those words in reference to reason, which forsakes wisdom and follows the senses.

[6] See Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Jerome.

[7] In connection with which Jerome interpreted τὴν μητέρα of the heavenly Jerusalem ; comp. Estius.

[8] But not Erasmus, Cajetanus, or Estius.

[9] See also *Catech. Rom.* ii. 8. 16 f.

[10] Calovius, and see the *Apol. Conf. Aug.* M. 204, J. 215.

Ver. 33. Πλήν] is usually explained to the effect, that it leads back to the proper theme after the digression of vv. 30–32, or merely ver. 32.[2] "Paulus prae nobilitate digressionis quasi oblitus propositae rei nunc ad rem revertitur," "Paul as it were forgetting his subject, through the nobleness of the digression, now returns to it," Bengel. A digression, however, has certainly not taken place, but vv. 30, 31 essentially belong to the description of the love of Christ to the church, and ver. 32 was a brief gloss pertaining to the right understanding of ver. 31, and not a digression. And πλήν is used by way doubtless of *breaking off* (Luke xix. 27, *al.*), but not of resuming. So also here: *Yet—not further to enter upon the subject of this μυστήριον—ye also ought* (as Christ the church), *each one individually, in such manner* (οὕτως, *i.e.*, in keeping with the ideal of Christ contained in this μυστήριον) *to love his own wife as himself.* With καί the *persons* appealed to, and with οὕτως the *mode* of what they are to do, are placed in a parallel with Christ. — οἱ καθ' ἕνα] *ye one by one, vos singuli, man by man.*[3] The following verb, however, has taken its regimen from ἕκαστος, not from the proper subject ἡμεῖς, as often also in classical writers.[4] — The *twofold designation οἱ καθ' ἕνα ἕκαστος* strengthens the conception, that *each one without exception*, etc. — ὡς ἑαυτόν] *as himself*, so that the love issues from, and is determined by, the point of view: ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἑαυτὸν ἀγαπᾷ, ver. 28. — ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα] ἡ δὲ γυνή is with emphasis absolutely[5] prefixed, not yet dependent on the notion of *volo* (see on 2 Cor. viii. 7) to be supplied in thought before ἵνα. Hence: *but the wife—she ought to fear her husband.* In this brief stern closing utterance, the apostle, while stating the obligation of the husband to love the wife ὡς ἑαυτόν, yet secures as concerns the wife the relation of subordination, namely, the duty of *reverence for the husband*—a duty, which is not done away with by that obligation on the part of the husband. "Optime cohaerebit concordia, si *utrimque* constabunt officia," "Harmony will best be maintained, if on both sides the duties be diligently observed," Erasmus, *Paraphr.* Rightly, we may add, in accordance with the context Oecumenius defines the notion of φοβῆται: ὡς πρέπει γυναῖκα φοβεῖσθαι, μὴ δουλοπρεπῶς, "Not in a servile way, but as is fitting that a wife fear." See vv. 22–24.

---

[1] In opposition to Schwegler, p. 387.

[2] Olshausen.

[3] See Matthiae, p. 1357.

[4] See Matthiae, p. 765; Stallbaum, *ad Gorg.* p. 503 E; Bornemann, *ad Cyrop.* iii. 1. 8.

[5] Winer, p. 506.

Notes by American Editor.

L. Ver. 4. *αἰσχρότης, καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπελία.*

The first is "the shameful, whether actively exhibited or passively approved in word, gesture or deed" (Ellicott). As to the second, "that which is meant here by stultiloquy or foolish speaking is the 'lubricum verbi,' as St. Ambrose calls it, the 'slipping with the tongue,' which prating people often suffer, whose discourses betray the vanity of their spirit, and discover 'the hidden man of the heart' (Jeremy Taylor, quoted by Trench). "Luther hits the mark with *Narrentheidinge*, buffoonery, which denotes what is high-flown, pompous, in loose discourse" (Braune). Both Stier and Trench call attention to the fact that, considering the sense of "fool" and "folly" in the N. T., something positive as well as negative is here indicated. The classical *εὐτράπελος* was "one ready with an answer or repartee." To be such "required polish, refinement, knowledge of the world, wit." Yet sin, by losing its coarseness, only became all the more dangerous. "In the finer talk of the world, its 'persiflage,' its 'badinage,' there is that which would attract many, whom scurrile buffoonery would only revolt and repel" (Trench). It is "that ribaldry, studied artifice, polite equivoque, which are worse in many cases than open foulness of tongue" (Eadie); that finds "occasion for wit or levity in anything, however sacred, fearing nothing so much as to be dull, and mistaking all seriousness and reserve for dulness" (Barry). "Pleasantry of every sort is not condemned by the apostle. He seems to refer to wit in connection with lewdness — *double entendre*" (Eadie). Stier remarks that even St. Paul did not abstain from wit, as may be seen in Acts xxvi. 29; 1 Cor. ix. 9, 10; 2 Cor. xii. 13, and adds: "But his wit is holy, full of meaning, and his jesting, if so it may be called, is inseparably united with the purest earnestness, as is proper. Never from mere pleasure in empty wit do we find the form without profitable contents, as well as never to the injury of his neighbor."

LI. Ver. 13. *πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστίν.*

The interpretation of Meyer has been adopted in the English Revised Version, and supported among others by Alford, Ellicott, Barry, Riddle. The chief objection urged by Olshausen and Eadie, "that light does not always exercise this transforming influence, for the devil and the wicked are reproved by the light, without themselves becoming light,'" is answered by Ellicott: "All that is asserted is that 'whatever is illumined is light; whether that tend to condemnation or the contrary depends upon the nature of the case and the inward operation of the outwardly illumining influence." "St. Paul here explains still more clearly what he means by illumination. It implies the catching the light and reflecting it so as to become a new source of light. It must be noted that the subject of the sentence is not 'the works of darkness,' but 'all things' in general. Hence the whole process is described, with almost scientific accuracy, as threefold. First, the things or persons are dragged out of darkness into light; then they are illuminated; lastly, they become light in themselves and to others. There are no doubt exceptions to this the right and normal process, in the case of the utterly reprobate, who have lost all power of reflecting light, and are, therefore, dark still in the blaze of noon; but the next verse shows that St. Paul is not contemplating these; and even these may be beacons of warning to others" (Barry).

LII. Ver. 14. διὸ λέγει. Ἔγειρε.

Better than Meyer's explanation is that of Ellicott: "It seems much more reverent, as well as much more satisfactory, to say that St. Paul, speaking under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is expressing in a condensed and summary form the spiritual meaning of the passage. The prophet's immediate words (Is. lxi., 1 sq.) supply, in substance, the first part of the quotation; the concluding part is the spiritual application of the remainder of the verse." See Terry's Biblical Hermeneutics, p. 500 sq.; Toy's Quotations in the N. T., p. 199 sq.

LIII. Ver. 16. ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρόν.

"That we are to make a wise use of circumstances for our own good or that of others, and like prudent merchants to buy up the fitting season for so doing" (Ellicott). Compare Dan. ii. 8: "I know that ye would gain the time," "*i.e.*, catch the opportunity to escape from difficulty" (Barry).

LIV. Ver. 18. μὴ οἴνῳ μεθύσκετε κ.τ.λ.

"It is a sensation of want, a desire to fly from himself, a craving after something which is felt to be out of reach, eager and restless thirst to enjoy some happiness and enlargement of heart, that usually leads to intemperance. But the Spirit fills Christians and gives them all the elements of cheerfulness and peace; genuine elevation and mental freedom; superiority to all depressing influences; and refined and permanent enjoyment. Of course, if they are so filled with the Spirit, they feel no appetite for debasing and material stimulants" (Eadie).

LV. Ver. 26. ἐν ῥήματι.

The construction is peculiar, and grammatical difficulties appear to whatever of the three words this clause be attached, the separation from the ἁγίασῃ being a great objection to Meyer's view. May not the true solution be indicated by the incidental remark of Ellicott that it belongs "to the whole expression"? Developing this still further, the idea would become "that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the word; for the means of this cleansing was by a washing of water, in accordance with and in virtue of the word." "Ἐν ῥήματι, if it be joined with καθαρίσας or with τῷ λούτρῳ τοῦ ὕδατος, means *in virtue of a word*, viz., of the word of salvation preached, ἐν being taken as in Acts iv. 7, 9, 10 . . . This καθ., etc., possesses its distinctive power and force because it takes place in virtue of a word, and ἐν ρ. serves only to complete the thought, the description of baptism. Hence the omission of the article" (Cremer's Lexicon, p. 267). Philippi (v. 1, 197) also calls attention to the fact that the omission of the article before the ῥήματι "marks the close, inseparable connection between the λουτρόν ὕδατος and the ῥῆμα." *Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum* (Augustine). "It is not the water that produces these effects, but the word of God which accompanies and is connected with the water, and our faith which relies on the word of God connected with the water" (Luther, Small Catechism, iv. 3). "If the word be taken away, the water is the same as that with which the servant cooks" (Luther, Large Catechism, p. 464).

Ellicott defines *ῥῆμα* as "the gospel," *i.e.*, "the word of God preached and taught preliminary to baptism," a view which is perfectly consistent with the word of divine institution and promise, since the entire gospel is epitomized therein.

LVI. Ver. 30. *ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν κ.τ.λ.*

While any direct allusion to the Lord's Supper must be rejected, nevertheless, as in John vi., a principle is here presented which finds its highest realization in that sacrament.

CHAPTER VI.

VER. 1. After *ὑμῶν* Elz. Scholz, Tisch. have *ἐν κυρίῳ*, in opposition to B D* F G, It. Marcion, Cyril, Cypr. Ambrosiast. Rejected by Mill, suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Rück., but defended (on the ground of Col. iii. 20) by Harless and Reiche. The latter with justice; since the witnesses who omit do not preponderate, and since for the purpose of a gloss not *ἐν κυρίῳ* but *ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ* (v. 22) would have suggested itself. If, however, *ἐν κυρίῳ* had been added from Col. *l.c.*, it would have been brought in after *δίκαιον*. — Ver. 5. *τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα*] Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] and Rück.: *τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις*, following A B ℵ, min. Clem. Dam. Theophyl. From Col. iii. 22.—Ver. 6. The article before *Χριστοῦ* is, with Lachm. and Tisch. [West. and Hort], in accordance with preponderating testimony, to be deleted. — Ver. 7. *ὡς*, which is wanting with Elz., is decidedly attested. —Ver. 8. *ὅ ἐάν τι ἕκαστος*] Lachm. [Treg.] and Rück. have *ἕκαστος ὅ ἐάν*, which was also recommended by Griesb., following A D E F G, min. Vulg. It. Bas. Dam. Other variations are, *ἕκαστος ἐάν τι* (B), *ἐὰν ποιήσ. ἕκαστος* (ℵ*), *ἐάν τι ποι. ἕκ.* (ℵ**), *ὅ ἐάν τις ἕκαστος* (1, 27, 32, *al.*), *ἐάν τι ἕκαστ.* (46, 115, *al.*, Theoph. ms.), *ἐάν τις ἕκαστ.* (62, 197, *al.*), *ἐάν τις* (or *τι*) *ἄνθρωπος* (Chrys. in Comment.). The best attested reading is accordingly *ἕκαστος ὅ ἐάν*. But if this had been the original one, it would not be at all easy to see how it could have given rise to variations, and specially to the introducing of the *τι*. The *Recepta*, on the other hand (again adopted by Tisch.), became very easily the source of the other readings, if the copyist passed over from OTI at once to the subsequent TI. Thus arose the corruption *ὅτι ἕκαστος ποιήσῃ κ.τ.λ.*, and thence, by means of different ways of restoring what had been omitted, were formed the variations, in which case *ἄνθρωπος* came in instead of *ἕκαστος* as a gloss, designed to indicate the *general* sense of *ἕκαστος*.—*κομιεῖται*] A B D* F G ℵ* Petr. alex.: *κομίσεται*.[1] So Lachm. Tisch. [Treg. West. and Hort], Rück. In Col. iii. 25, likewise, these two forms are found side by side in the critical witnesses. Nevertheless here, as there, *κομίσεται* is more strongly attested, and hence to be preferred. *κομιεῖται* may have originated in a reminiscence of 1 Pet. v. 4. — Ver. 9. *ὑμῶν αὐτῶν*] many variations, among which *αὐτῶν κ. ὑμῶν* (so Lachm. Tisch. [Treg. West. and Hort], Rück. and Harless; recommended also by Griesb.) is that most strongly attested, namely, by A B D* min. Arm. Vulg. Goth. Copt. Clem. Pet. Chrys. (alicubi) Damasc. Jer. Aug. Pel. Rightly. The mention of the *slaves* (*αὐτῶν*) appeared here partly in itself, partly from a comparison with Col. iv. 1, not relevant; hence the *Recepta* (anew defended by Reiche) *ὑμῶν αὐτῶν*, in which case *αὐτῶν* applies to the *masters*, just as *αὐτῶν ὑμῶν* in E F G, and merely *ὑμῶν* in 17. Others, leaving the *καί* standing, at least prefixed *ὑμῶν* (L, min. Syr. p. Fathers: *ὑμῶν καὶ αὐτῶν*). ℵ* testifies in favor of Lachmann's reading by *ἑαυτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν*, whereas ℵ**, like the others, has regarded the prefixing of ὑμῶν (thus ὑμ. κ. ἑαυτ.) as necessary. — Ver. 10. τὸ λοιπόν] Lachm. Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort. and Rück. read τοῦ λοιποῦ, following A B ℵ* 17, 73, 118, Cyril, Procop. Dam. Thus at least not preponderantly supported. In favor, however, of τὸ λοιπόν, testifies also the reading δυναμοῦσθε, which is found in B 17, instead of the following ἐνδυναμοῦσθε, and probably has arisen from the confounding on the part of the copyist of the N in λοιπόν with the N in ENδυναμοῦσθε. Since, moreover, τὸ λοιπόν better accords with the sense than τοῦ λοιποῦ (see on Gal. vi. 17), I hold the latter to be a mechanical repetition from Gal. *l.c.* — The following ἀδελφοί μου is wanting in B D E ℵ* Aeth. Arm. Clar. Germ. Goth. Cyril, Damasc. Lucifer, Ambrosiast. Jerome ; while in A[1] F G, codd. Ital. Syr. p. Vulg. Theodoret, only μου is wanting. ἀδελφοί μου, which Griesb. also holds suspected, and Lachm. Tisch. Rück. [West. and Hort], have deleted, is an addition from Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8 ; 2 Thess. iii. 1 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 11. And this addition, too, tells in favor of the originality of τὸ λοιπόν. — Ver. 12. ἡμῖν] B D* F G, 52, 115, Syr. Ar. pol. Slav. ant. It. Goth. Lucif. Ambrosiast. : ὑμῖν. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Rück. But how naturally would ὑμῖν suggest itself to the copyists, inasmuch as the whole context speaks in the second person ! — τοῦ σκότους τούτου] Elz. has τοῦ σκ. τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, in opposition to decisive witnesses. Expansion by way of gloss. — Ver. 16. ἐπὶ πᾶσιν] Lachm. [West. and Hort] reads ἐν πᾶσιν, for which more current expression, however, only B ℵ, min. Vulg. It. and some Fathers testify, and several vss. are doubtful. — τά before πεπυρ. is wanting, indeed, in B D* F G, and is deleted by Lachm., but was easily regarded as superfluous and thus passed over. — Ver. 17. δέξασθε] is wanting in D* F G, codd. It. and various Fathers, while A D*** K L and min. read δέξασθαι (so Matth.), and Arm. places δέξασθε before τὴν περικεφ. Suspected by Griesb. But if *no* verb had stood, and a gloss had been supplied, we should most naturally expect ἀναλάβετε to be added. In consideration, however, of the *seeming redundancy*, it is much more likely that the *omission* was made. The *infinitive* has come in after the preceding σβέσαι. — Ver. 18. αὐτὸ τοῦτο] A B ℵ, min. Basil, Chrys. (in commentary) Damasc. have only αὐτό ; D* F G have αὐτόν, and Latins *in illum* or *in illo* s. ipso, which readings likewise tell in favor of the simple αὐτό. With reason (in opposition to Reiche) τοῦτο is disapproved by Griesb., and rejected by Lachm. Tisch. [Treg., West. and Hort] and Rück. An exegetical, more precise definition in accordance with Paul's practice elsewhere. — Ver. 19. δοθῇ] Elz. has δοθείη, in opposition to decisive testimony. Perhaps occasioned by a mere repetition of the H in copying. — Ver. 21. εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς] Lachm. and Rück. read καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε. So A D E F G ℵ, min. Vulg. It. Theodoret, Lat. Fathers. In what follows Lachm. and Rück. [West. and Hort] place γνωρίσει *before* ὑμῖν, following B D E F G ℵ, min. It. Goth. Ambrosiast. The latter from Col. iv. 7. And the former is to be explained from the circumstance that καὶ ὑμεῖς was, through inattention to the reference of the καί, omitted as superfluous (so still in cod. 17), and was thereupon reintroduced according to the order of the words which primarily suggested itself, by which means it came *before* εἰδῆτε.

---

[1] A reads ΚΟΜΙΣΕΤΕ, and thus testifies indirectly in favor of *κομίσεται*.

CONTENTS.—How the *children* (vv. 1–3), the *fathers* (ver. 4), the *slaves* (vv. 5–8), and the *masters* (ver. 9) are to demean themselves. Concluding exhortation to the acquiring of Christian strength, for which purpose the readers are to put on the whole armor of God, and thus armed to stand forth, in order victoriously to sustain the conflict with the diabolic powers (vv. 10–17) ; in connection with which they are ever to apply themselves to prayer, and to make intercession for all Christians, and, in particular, for the apostle (vv. 18–20). Sending of Tychicus (vv. 21, 22). Concluding wishes (vv. 23, 24).

---

[1] A has ἀδελφοί only after ἐνδυναμοῦσθε.

Ver. 1. Ἐν κυρίῳ] characterizes the obedience as *Christian*, the activity of which moves *in Christ*, with whom the Christian withal stands in communion of life. The reference to *God*[1] is already refuted by the very ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ, iv. 21, placed at the head of all these precepts, as also by the standing formula itself (comp. Col. iii. 20). — δίκαιον] *right*, *i.e.*, κατὰ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμον, "according to God's law," Theodoret. Comp. Col. iv. 1 ; Phil. i. 7, iv. 8 ; 2 Thess. i. 6 ; Luke xii. 57.—In favor of *infant baptism*, *i.e.*, in favor of the view that the children of *Christians* were as early as that time baptized, nothing at all follows from the exhortation of the apostle to the children.[2] The children of Christians were, through their fellowship of life with their Christian parents, even without baptism ἅγιοι (see on 1 Cor. vii. 14 ; Acts xvi. 15), and had to render to their parents obedience ἐν κυρίῳ. [See Note LVII., p. 557.]

Ver. 2. The *frame of mind* towards the parents, from which the ὑπακούειν just demanded of the children must proceed, is the τιμᾶν. Hence Paul continues, and that in the express hallowed words of the fourth commandment : τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου κ.τ.λ. (Ex. xx. 12 ; Deut. v. 16). And as he had before subjoined the general motive of morality τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι δίκαιον, so he now subjoins the particular incitement ἥτις ἐστιν ἐντολὴ πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελ., so that the relation as well of the two precepts themselves, as of their motives, vv. 1, 2, is *climactic*, and ἥτις . . . ἐπαγγελίᾳ can by no means be a *parenthesis*.[3] — ἥτις] *utpote quae*, "since it is," specifies a reason. See on iii. 13. — ἐντολὴ πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελ.] The article is not necessary with the πρώτη, which is in itself defining, or with the ordinal numbers generally.[4] Comp. Acts xvi. 12 ; Phil. i. 12, *al.* And the statement that the commandment *first* as to *number* in the Decalogue has a promise, is not inconsistent with the facts, since the promise, Ex. xx. 6, Deut. v. 10, is a *general* one, having reference to the commandments *as a whole.* Just as little is it to be objected that *no* further commandment with a promise *follows* in the Decalogue ; for Paul says πρώτη, having before his mind not only the Decalogue, but also *the* entire *series of all the divine precepts*, which begins with the Decalogue. Among the commandments, which God has given at the time of the Mosaic legislation and in all the subsequent period, the commandment : "Honor father and mother," is the first which is given with a promise. The apparent objection is thus removed in a simple manner by our taking ἐντολή as *divine commandment* in general, and not restricting it to the sense "commandment in the

---

[1] "Praeter naturae legem . . . *Dei* quoque auctoritate sancitum docent," "In addition to the law of nature, they teach that which is established by the authority of God," Calvin ; comp. Wolf.

[2] In opposition to Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 192.

[3] Griesbach, Rückert, and others.

[4] Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* vii. 7. 35.

Decalogue." If Paul had had *merely* the Decalogue in mind, he must have written : the *only* commandment.[1] For the assumption that "it is the first, not with regard to those which follow, but to those which have preceded,"[2] would not even be necessarily resorted to, if it were really established—which, however, is assumed entirely without proof—that Paul had taken into account *merely* the ten commandments, seeing that he and every one of his readers *knew* that no other commandment of the ten had a promise. From the arbitrary presupposition, that *merely* the Decalogue was taken into account, it followed of necessity in the case of *other* expositors, either that they restricted ἐντολή simply to the commandments of the *second table*,[3] in connection with which Holzhausen even maintained that ἐντολή never denotes a commandment in reference to God (see Matt. xxii. 36, 38 ; Mark xii. 28) ; or else that they tampered with the numerical sense of πρώτη, and made out of it a *very important*, *a chief commandment*.[4] What a feeble motive would thus result ! and πρώτη would in fact mean *the most important*, which, however, the fourth commandment is *not* (Matt. xxii. 38 ; Rom. xiii. 9, 10 ; Gal. v. 14). Further, the proposal of Erasmus, that πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελ. should be held to apply to the *definite* promise of ver. 3, mention of which *first* occurs in the fourth commandment, is not worthy of attention,[5] but erroneous ; because the same promise occurs *after* the fourth commandment only with a *general* reference to the commandments *as a whole* (Deut. v. 33, vi. 2), as it has also occurred even *before* the fourth commandment in such a general form (Deut. iv. 40) ; and because, besides, ἐπαγγ. could not but have the *article*. — ἐν ἐπαγγελ.] is to be closely attached to πρώτη, as expressing that, *wherein* this commandment is the first, the point in which the predicate pertains to it. Comp. Diodor. xiii. 37 : ἐν δὲ εὐγενείᾳ καὶ πλούτῳ πρῶτος, "the first in nobility and richness," Soph. *O. R.* 33 : πρῶτος ἐν συμφοραῖς, "the first in results." *In point of promise* it is the first (οὐ τῇ τάξει, "not in order," Chrysostom).

Ver. 3. After Paul has just said : "*the first commandment with promise,*" he now adduces the *definite* promise, on account of which this predicate pertains to that commandment, and that according to the LXX. of Ex. xx. 12, Deut. v. 16, with immaterial variation (LXX. : καὶ ἵνα μακροχρ. γένῃ ἐπὶ τ. γ.), and with omission of the more precise designation of Palestine, which in the LXX. follows after γῆς. This omission, however, was not occasioned by the circumstance that the promise was to bear upon *long life*

---

[1] According to Bleek, Paul had not at the moment the form of the following commandments of the Decalogue definitely before his mind. But with such inadvertence no one is less to be charged than Paul.

[2] Harless.

[3] In opposition to this, Erasmus aptly remarks : "Haec distinctio non est fundata in s. literis, sed est commentum recentiorum theologorum," "This distinction is not grounded in the Holy Scriptures, but is a fiction of more recent theologians." In general it is to be observed that, according to Philo and Josephus, each of the two tables contained *five* commandments, not, as Augustine (whom Luther followed) supposed, the first *three*, and the second *seven*, —and thus two sacred numbers, in which case, moreover, there was found in the first table a reference to the Trinity. Ambrosiaster, Zachariae, Michaelis, the latter misconstruing the absence of the article before ἐντολὴ πρώτη as favoring his view.

[4] Koppe, Morus, Flatt, Matthies, Meier.

[5] Harless.

in general,[1] in which case, indeed, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς might also have been left out ; but Paul could so fully presuppose acquaintance with the complete words of the promise, that with the mere ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς enough was said to preclude any misunderstanding which should depart from the original sense : *in the land*, *i.e.*, Palestine. So, namely, in accordance with the sense of the original text well known to the readers, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is to be understood, not as "*upon earth ;*" for the promise is here adduced *historically*. Hence its original sense is not at all to be altered or spiritualized, or to be taken conditionally, as *e.g.* was done by Zanchius : if the promise is not fulfilled *simpliciter*, "absolutely," yet it is fulfilled *commutatione in majus*, "by a change to what is greater ;" or by Calovius : "Promissiones temporales *cum conditione* intelligendae, quantum sc. temporalia illa nobis salutaria fore Deus censuerit," "Temporal promises must be understood conditionally, viz., so far as God regarded that these temporal matters would be salutary to us ;" comp. also Estius, who at the same time remarks[2] that the land of Canaan prefigures the kingdom of heaven (comp. Matt. v. 5), and the long life everlasting blessedness. Nor is it to be said, with Bengel, Morus, Stolz, Rosenmüller, Flatt, and Harless, that the earthly blessing is promised not to the *individual*, but to the *people*. For in the summons "*thou shalt*" in the Decalogue, although the latter on the whole (as a whole) is directed to the *people*, the *individual* is withal addressed, as is evident from the very commandments in which the neighbor is mentioned, and as is the view underlying all the N. T. citations from the Decalogue-law, Matt. xv. 4, v. 21, 27 ; Rom. vii. 7, xiii. 9. — εὖ σοι γένηται] Comp. Gen. xii. 13 ; Deut. iv. 40 ; Ecclus. i. 13. A Greek would employ εὖ πάσχειν, εὖ πράττειν, or the like, or even ἀγαθά σοι γένηται. — καὶ ἔσῃ κ.τ.λ.] is regarded by Winer, p. 258, and de Wette,[3] not as dependent upon ἵνα, but as a direct continuation of the discourse. But this expedient is unnecessary, inasmuch as ἵνα with the future actually occurs in the case of Paul (see on 1 Cor. ix. 18 ; Gal. ii. 4) ; and is, moreover, here out of place, since there is not any direct continuation of the discourse in those passages of the O. T., the sense of which Paul reproduces. At Rev. xxii. 14 also the future and subjunctive are interchanged after ἵνα, as also in classical writers the same variation after ὅπως is well known.[4] And how aptly do the two modes of construction here suit the sense, so that γένηται expresses the pure *becoming realized*, and ἔσῃ μακροχρόν. the *certain emergence and continued subsistence*.[5] The change is a logical climax.

Ver. 4. *The duty of fathers*, negative and positive. — καὶ οἱ πατέρες] *and ye fathers*, so that καί quickly subjoins. Comp. ver. 9. Paul does not address the *mothers*, not because he is thinking of the training of *grown-up* children,[6] nor on account of an Oriental depreciation of the mothers,[7] in opposition to which view—even apart from passages like Prov. xiv. 1, xxxi. 10 ff.—the whole teaching of the apostle concerning the relation of husband and wife in marriage (v. 25 ff.) is decisive ; but because the husband, as the head of the wife, has, even in the bringing up of children the *rule*, and the wives join in prosecuting the work of training *ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν* (v. 22 ff.). — *μὴ παροργίζετε*] by injustice, harshness, hastiness of temper, undue severity, and the like, whereby the children are *irritated* against the fathers ; at Col. iii. 21 there is subjoined as motive *ἵνα μὴ ἀθυμῶσιν*. — *ἐκτρέφετε*] not as at v. 29, but of the *bringing up*, and that on its *moral* side. Prov. xxiii. 24 ; 1 Macc. vi. 15, 55 ; Plato, *Gorg.* p. 471 C ; Polyb. vi. 6. 2.[1] — *ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νουθεσίᾳ κυρίου*] *ἐν* denotes the regulative *element, in which* the training is to take place.[2] Hence : *in the Lord's training and correction*. *παιδεία* is the general term, the *training of children* as a whole, and *νουθεσία* is the special one, the *reproof* aiming at amendment, whether this admonition take place by means of words[3] or of actual punishments.[4] See Gellius, vi. 14 ; Kypke, *Obss. ad* 1 *Thess.* v. 14. With regard to the form, in place of which the better Greek has *νουθέτησις*, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 512. [See Note LVIII., p. 557.] *κυρίου* means neither *to the Lord*,[5] nor *according to the doctrine of Christ*,[6] nor *worthily of the Lord*,[7] or the like ; but it is the subjective genitive, so that the Lord Himself is conceived as *exercising the training and reproof*, in so far, namely, as Christ by His Spirit impels and governs the fathers therein.[8] Rückert is unable to come to a decision, and doubts whether Paul himself had a distinct idea before his mind.

---

[1] Calvin, Koppe, Rückert, Matthies, Schenkel, and many.

[2] So again typically Olshausen, comp. Baumgarten-Crusius.

[3] Comp. already Erasmus.

[4] See on the erroneous *canon Dawesianus*, Bremi, in Schaef. *Appar. ad Dem.* I. p. 277; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 335 f. ; Buttmann, *Neutest. Gramm.* p. 184 [E. T. 213].

[5] Kühner, II. p. 491.

[6] So quite arbitrarily Olshausen.

[7] Rückert.

Ver. 5. On vv. 5–9, comp. Col. iii. 22–iv. 1. — Here, too, there is doubtless no approval, but at the same time no disapproval of the existing slavery in itself, which—in accordance with the apostolic view of a Christian's position (Gal. iii. 28 ; 1 Cor. vii. 22 ; comp. Tit. ii. 9 f. ; 1 Pet. ii. 18)—like every other outward relation of life, ought not to affect spiritual freedom and Christian unity ; hence at 1 Cor. vii. 21 it is expressly prescribed that the slave is to remain in his position,[9] as, indeed, Paul even sent back Onesimus after his conversion to his master, without requiring of the latter his manumission.[10] — *τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα*] to those, who in a merely human relation are your rulers, *i.e.*, *your human masters*, whose slaves you are as regards outward temporal position in life, by way of distinction from the higher divine master, Christ ; hence also τοῖς κυρ. κ. σ. stands without repetition of the article, combined into *one* idea ; comp. on ii. 11. As Paul immediately after makes mention of the higher master Christ (ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ), it was very natural for him, in view of the twofold and very diverse relation of masters which was now present to his mind, to add κατὰ σάρκα, in the use of which any special set purpose cannot be made good. This in opposition to Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, who find in it a consolatory allusion to the δεσποτεία πρόσκαιρος, "temporary mastership ;" in opposition to Calvin, who supposes a *softening* of the relation to be conveyed in this expression, as being one that leaves the spiritual freedom untouched ;[1] and in opposition to Harless, who finds in the predicate the thought that, although in another domain they are free, yet in earthly relations they had masters. — μετὰ φόβου κ. τρόμ.] *i.e.*, with that zeal, which is ever keenly apprehensive of not doing enough. Comp. on 1 Cor. ii. 3 ; 2 Cor. vii. 15 ; Phil. ii. 12. — ἐν ἁπλότητι τῆς καρδ. ὑμ.] State of heart, in which the obedience with fear and trembling is to take place ; it is to be no *hypocritical* one, in which we are otherwise minded than we outwardly seem, but an *upright*, inwardly true one, *without duplicity* of disposition and act. Comp. Rom. xii. 8 ; 2 Cor. viii. 2, ix. 11 ; Jas. i. 5. In Philo joined with ἀκακία.[2] Oecumenius well observes : ἔνι γὰρ καὶ μετὰ φόβου κ. τρόμου δουλεύειν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ εὐνοίας ἀλλὰ κακούργως, "for it is possible to serve with fear and trembling, and yet not with good will, but malevolently." — ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ] *as to Christ*, so that you regard your obedience to your masters as rendered to Christ (comp. v. 22).[3] See ver. 6. An allusion to *reward*[4] is imported.

---

[1] See Wyttenbach, *ad Plut. de educ.* p. 66 ; Lennep, *ad Phalar.* p. 350 *b*.

[2] Comp. Polyb. i. 65. 7 : *τῶν ἐν παιδείαις κ. νόμοις κ. πολιτικοῖς ἔθεσιν ἐκτεθραμμένων*, "Of those brought up in the training and laws and political customs."

[3] *νουθετικοὶ λόγοι*, Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 21.

[4] *οἱ μὲν ῥάβδοι νουθετοῦσι κ.τ.λ.*, Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* p. 283.

[5] Luther.

[6] Erasmus, Beza, Vatablus, Menochius, Estius, Zachariae, Koppe, Morus, Rosenmüller, Bisping, and others, including Holzhausen, who, however, takes *κυρ.* of *God*.

[7] Matthies.

[8] Comp. Soph. *Electr.* 335 : *ἅπαντα γάρ σοι τἀμὰ νουθετήματα κείνης διδακτὰ, κοὐδὲν ἐκ σαυτῆς λέγεις*, "For all the admonitions given by you to me are of her teaching ; you speak nothing of yourself."

[9] Comp. Ignat. *ad Polyc.* 4 ; *Constitt. Apost.* iv. 12, vii. 13 ; viii. 32, 2 f.

[10] The reforming efficacy of the gospel addresses itself to knowledge and feeling, out of which, and so out of the inner life of faith, the alterations of the outward forms and relations of life gradually take shape with moral necessity by way of consequence ; as history, too, has shown, which, when it has developed itself in a revolutionary manner, has either violently precipitated, or forsaken, or inverted that course, or else in its necessary development has encountered such hindrances as disowned the influence of this necessary development, and yet could not arrest it. "Civi-

Vv. 6, 7. The ἐν ἁπλότητι . . . Χριστῷ just spoken of is now more precisely described. — μὴ κατ' ὀφθαλμ. ὡς ἀνθρ.] *not after an eye-serving manner as men-pleasers.* The word ὀφθαλμοδουλεία occurs nowhere else than here and Col. iii. 3, but its meaning is, from its composition, clear.[5] It is the service which is rendered to the *eyes* of the master, but in which the aim is merely to acquire the *semblance* of fidelity, inasmuch as one makes himself thus noticeable when seen by the master, but is in reality not such, acting, on the contrary, otherwise when his back is turned.[6] — ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι] Comp. Ps. liii. 5 ; Psalt. Sal. iv. 8. 10, in Fabric. ;[7] and see Lobeck.[8] The *men*

---

tates *malis* studiis *malis*que doctrinis repente evertuntur," "States are suddenly overthrown by wicked desires and wicked doctrines," Cic. *Leg.* ii. 15. 39. It is not, however, to be overlooked that by the apostle's mode of regarding the relation of freedom and slavery *which he found existing*, the slavery *introduced* by Christians, the enslaving of free men, the slave trade, etc., are by no means justified—rather are these things impossible, where the knowledge and feeling, that spring from evangelical faith, are the principles which *shape* the life and the forms assumed by it.

[1] Comp. Beza, Zanchius, Grotius, Flatt, and others.

[2] See Loesner, *Obss.* p. 262.

[3] [ὣς τύπῳ Θεοῦ, *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, line 104.]

[4] Theodoret.

[5] Comp. ὀφθαλμόδουλος in the *Constitt. Apost.* iv. 12. 2.

[6] Theodoret : τὴν οὐκ ἐξ εἰλικρινοῦς καρδίας προσφερομένην θεραπείαν, ἀλλὰ τῷ σχήματι κεχρωσμένην," "the service rendered not from a pure heart, but adopting the semblance."

[7] *Cod. Pseud.* i. p. 929.

[8] *Ad Phryn.* p. 621.

whom such slaves endeavor to please are just their *masters*, and the fault of this behavior lies in the fact that such endeavor is not conditioned by the higher point of view of serving Christ and doing the will of God, but has as its aim simply *human* approbation. Even of slaves Matt. vi. 24 holds good. Comp. Gal. i. 10. — *ἀλλ' ὡς δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ, ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς*] *but as slaves of Christ, in that ye do the will of God from the heart.* The contrast lies in *δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ* (comp. ver. 7), and *ποιοῦντες κ.τ.λ.* is a modal definition of this their service, whereupon there follows in ver. 7 yet a second modal definition. Now to be a slave of Christ and not to do the will of God, and that indeed *ex animo* (from a genuine impulse of the soul), would be a contradiction, seeing that God is the Father of Christ, has sent Christ, and is the Head of Christ (1 Cor. xi. 3, iii. 23). According to Rückert, *ὡς δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ* is *subordinate*, and *ποιοῦντες τ. θέλ. τ. Θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς* forms the contrast : "but doing as Christ's servants the will of God from the heart." But after *ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι*, comp. with ver. 5, this subordination of *ὡς δοῦλοι Χρ.* is altogether arbitrary and opposed to the context. *ἐκ ψυχῆς* is no doubt attached to what follows by Syriac, Chrysostom, Jerome, Bengel, Koppe, Knapp, Lachmann, Harless, de Wette ; but *μετ' εὐνοίας*,[1] since it expresses the well-meaning *disposition*, already in fact includes in itself the sense of *ἐκ ψυχῆς* ;[2] and it is arbitrary to assume, with Harless, that *ἐκ ψ.* expresses the relation of the true servant to his *service*, and *μετ' εὐνοίας* his relation to his *master*. — *ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ*] *s.c. δουλεύοντες, as to the Lord*, the true *mode of regarding* his service as rendered to *Christ*. —*καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρ.*] Comp. on Gal. i. 1.

Ver. 8. Εἰδότες] Incitement to the mode of service demanded, vv. 5–7 : *since ye know that whatever good thing each one shall have done, he shall bear off this* (the good done) *from the Lord, whether he be slave or free.* — *ὃ ἐάν τι ἕκαστος*] *ἐάν* in the relative clause with the subjunctive instead of *ἄν*,[3] and *τί* separated from *ὅς*.[4] — *τοῦτο κομ.*] Expression of *entirely adequate recompense.* See on 2 Cor. v. 10. — *παρὰ κυρίου*] *from Christ*, at the judgment. — *εἴτε δοῦλος, εἴτε ἐλεύθ.*] *ἔδειξε τῷ παρόντι βίῳ πεπωρισμένην τὴν δουλείαν καὶ δεσποτείαν, μετὰ δέ γε τὴν ἐντεῦθεν ἐκδημίαν οὐκ ἔτι δουλείας καὶ δεσποτείας, ἀλλ' ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας ἐσομένην διαφοράν*, "He showed the servitude and mastership obtaining in the present life, but after the departure hence, the difference to be no longer between servitude and mastership, but between virtue and wickedness," Theodoret. It is evident, we may add, from our passage that Paul did *not* think of a ceasing of slavery among Christians before the Parousia, —a view which was very naturally connected with the conception of the *nearness* of the latter, which did not admit of his looking forth upon the development of centuries.

Ver. 9. Καὶ οἱ κύριοι] like *καὶ οἱ πατέρες*, ver. 4. — *τὰ αὐτά*] *the same.* The master, namely, who treats his servants *μετ' εὐνοίας*, does essentially (measured by the disposition as the inner essence of the act) the same thing towards the slaves as the slave serving *μετ' εὐνοίας* does towards his master. — *ἀνιέντες τὴν ἀπειλ.*] Negative modal definition of the *τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖτε πρὸς αὐτούς*, especially to be laid to heart in the circumstances by the masters. By *ἀνιέντες* may be denoted either the *abating*, or the entire *leaving off*, *giving up*, of the threatening. In the former sense (Wisd. xvi. 24) it has been taken by Erasmus,[1] Vatablus, Zeger ; but certainly the latter sense alone[2] is appropriate to the *τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖτε* ; especially as *τὴν ἀπειλήν* (with the article) denotes not threatening in general, but *the* threatening, namely, "quemadmodum vulgus dominorum solet," "as the common crowd of masters is wont."[3] — *εἰδότες*] specifying a motive, as in ver. 8. Comp. Col. iv. 1 ; *Barnab.* 19 ; *Constitt. ap.* vii. 13. Inasmuch, namely, as they know that He, who is Lord as well of the slaves as of the masters (*καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν*, see the critical remarks), is in heaven (the exalted Christ), and with Him is no partiality, so that He gives to the master as such no preference over the slave as such : how should they not cease to comport themselves with their threatening, as though Christ were not the Lord *of both* in heaven—in *heaven*, whence at the judgment He will, *without partiality*, alike sustain the injured rights of the slaves, and punish the unchristian threatening of the masters, which, instead of operating by moral means, only terrifies by rude authority. Comp. Seneca, *Thyest.* 607 :

---

[1] Comp. Xen. *Oec.* xii. 5. 7.

[2] *Ex animi sententia*, Col. iii. 23 ; Mark xii. 30, 33 ; Luke x. 27 ; Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 6. 3 ; Xen. *Anab.* vii. 7. 43 ; Nicarch. *epigr.* 2 ; Theocr. *Idyll.* iii. 35.

[3] Buttmann, *neut. Gramm.* p. 63 [E. T. 72].

[4] As in Plato, *Legg.* ix. p. 864 E : ἣν ἄν τινα καταβλάψῃ, Lys. p. 160 : ὃς ἄν τις ὑμᾶς εὖ ποιῇ.

> "Vos, quibus rector maris atque terrae
> Jus dedit magnum necis atque vitae
> Ponite inflatos tumidosque vultus.
> Quicquid a vobis minor extimescit,
> Major hoc vobis dominus minatur ;
> Omne sub regno graviore regnum est."

"Ye, to whom the ruler of sea and earth has entrusted the great right of life and death, dismiss your elated and arrogant looks. Whatever an inferior dreads from you, that a master greater than you threatens. Every sovereignty is beneath a sovereignty still more severe." As to the notion of *προσωποληψία*, see on Gal. ii. 6.

Ver. 10.[4] After this special table of domestic duties laid down since v. 21, now follows, in a full energetic effusion down to ver. 20, a general *final exhortation*, winding up the whole paraenetic portion of the Epistle (iv. 1 ff.). — *τὸ λοιπόν*] *as concerns the rest*, namely, what you have still to do in addition to what has been hitherto mentioned. Comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 11 ; Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8 ; 1 Thess. iv. 1 ; 2 Thess. iii. 1. — *ἐνδυναμοῦσθε ἐν κυρίῳ*] denotes the *Christian* strengthening, which cannot subsist outside of Christ, but only in Him as the life-element of the Christian (Phil. iv. 13). As to *ἐνδυναμοῦσθαι*, *to become strong*, *gain strength*, which is not a middle,[5] see on Rom. iv. 20. — *καὶ ἐν τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ*] *and by means of the might of His strength*, which might, namely, must produce the strengthening in you. As to the respective notions, see on i. 19. The καί is not explicative, but annexes to the element, *in which* the strengthening is to take place, the *effective principle* of it (2 Cor. xii. 9). "Domini virtus nostra est," "The Lord's power is ours," Bengel.

---

[1] "Minus feroces minusque minabundi," "less fierce and less threatening."

[2] Comp. Thucyd. iii. 10. 2: ἔχθραν ἀνιέντας.

[3] Erasmus, *Paraphr.*

[4] On vv. 10–17, see Winzer, *Leipz. Pfingstprogramm*, 1840.

[5] "Corroborate vos," "strengthen yourselves," Piscator.

Ver. 11. What they are to do in order to become thus strong, in connection with which the figurative discourse represents the readers as *warriors* (comp. 2 Cor. x. 4 ; 1 Thess. v. 8 ; Rom. vi. 13, 23, xiii. 12 ; 1 Tim. i. 18, vi. 12 ; 2 Tim. iv. 7). The more familiar, however, this figure was to the apostle, the more freely and independently is it here carried out, although[1] a reminiscence of Isa. lix. 17[2] underlies it.[3] — τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ] τὴν πανοπλ. has the emphasis. In the very fact that not merely single pieces of the armor,[4] but the *whole* armor of God is put on,[5] resides the capacity of resistance to the devil. If τοῦ Θεοῦ had the emphasis,[6] there must have been a contrast to *other* spiritual weapons (for that no material, actual weapons were meant, was self-evident). Rightly, therefore, have most expositors kept by the literal meaning of πανοπλία, *complete suit of armor* of the heavy-armed soldier, ὁπλίτης ;[7] and the assertion[8] that it here is equivalent generally to *armatura* [*i.e.*, the armor, but not the arms],[9] is arbitrary and contrary to linguistic usage ; even in Judith xiv. 3, 2 Macc. iii. 25, the notion of the *complete* equipment is to be adhered to.[10] According to Polybius, vi. 23, 2 ff., there belong to the Roman πανοπλία shield, sword, greaves, spear, breastplate, helmet. But the circumstance that in the detailed carrying out of the figure, ver. 13 ff., not *all* these parts are mentioned (the *spear* is wanting), and withal some portions are brought in (girdle, military sandals) which did not belong exclusively to the equipment of the heavy-armed soldier, but to military equipment in general, can, least of all in the case of Paul, occasion surprise or betray a special set purpose. Whether, we may add, the apostle thought of a *Jewish* or a *Roman* warrior is, doubtless, substantially in itself a matter of indifference, since the kinds of armor in the two cases were in general the same;[11] but the latter supposition is the most natural, inasmuch as the *Roman* soldiery wielded the power in all the provinces, Paul himself was surrounded by Roman soldiery, and for most Gentile readers in a non-Jewish province the term πανοπλία could not but call up the thought of the *Roman* soldier. Even though Paul had, as we must suppose, the recollection of Isa. lix. 17 when he was employing such figurative language, this did not prevent his transferring the prophetic reminiscence to the conception of a Roman warrior (in opposition to Harless). — τοῦ Θεοῦ] genitivus *auctoris*, "genitive of the author:" the πανοπλία, *which comes from God*, which God furnishes. Sense without the figure : "*appropriate to yourselves all the means of defence and offence which God bestows, in order to be in a position to withstand the machinations of the devil.*" — στῆναι πρός] *stand one's ground against ;* a *military* expression in keeping with the figure.[1] The same thing is implied by στῆναι with the dative, Hom. *Il.* xxi. 600. Comp. ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ, Jas. iv. 7. — τὰς μεθοδ.] See on iv. 14. The *plural* denotes the concrete manifestations, Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 1. 11. Luther aptly renders : the wily assaults.— τοῦ διαβόλου] "principis hostium, qui ver. 12 ostenduntur," "the chief of the enemies indicated in ver. 12," Bengel.

---

[1] Comp. on τοῦ σωτηρίου, ver. 17.

[2] Comp. Wisd. v. 17 ff., and thereon Grimm, *Handb.* p. 119 f.

[3] According to de Wette, we have here "a *playful imitation* in detail of 1 Thess. v. 8, in which use is made of Isa. lix. 17 (perhaps also of Wisd. v. 17 ff.)." An unwarranted judgment, inasmuch as Paul himself could here carry out more comprehensively his figure elsewhere thrown out in only a few outlines, and this he has done worthily and without attempt at play. An *imitator*, on the other hand, would here have assigned no *other* signification to the pieces of armor mentioned 1 Thess. v. 8 than they bear in that place.

[4] Luther : *harness.*

[5] "Ne quid nobis desit," "that nothing may be lacking to us," Calvin.

[6] Harless.

[7] See Herod. i. 60; Plato, *Legg.* vii. p. 796 B; Bos, *Exercitt.* p. 192; Ottii *Spicileg.* p. 409.

[8] Recently by Harless.

[9] Vulgate, which was justly censured by Beza.

[10] Of the manner in which *Paul himself* wore and wielded the πανοπλία τοῦ Θεοῦ, his whole labors and each one of his Epistles afford the most brilliant evidence; the latter especially in such outbursts as Rom. viii. 31 ff.; 2 Cor. vi. 4 ff., 11, 23 ff. Comp. also 2 Cor. x. 4 f.

[11] See Keil, *Arch.* § 158.

Ver. 12. I am warranted in saying πρὸς τὰς μεθοδ. τοῦ διαβόλου ; for we have not the wrestling with feeble *men*, but we have to contend with the *diabolic powers.* This contrast Paul expresses *descriptively*, and with what rhetorical power and swelling fulness ! Observe, moreover, that the conflict to which Paul here refers is, according to ver. 13, still *future ;* but it is by ἔστιν *realized as present.* — οὐκ . . . ἀλλά] The negation is not *non tam*, or *non tantum*, "not so," or "not so much,"[2] but *absolute ;*[3] since the conflict on the part of our opponents is one excited and waged *not* by men, *but* by the devilish powers (though these make use of men too as organs of their hostility to the kingdom of God).[4] — ἡ πάλη] The article denotes generically the *kind* of conflict, which does not take place in the case of the Christians (ἡμῖν) ; they have not *the wrestling with blood and flesh.* Nothing else, namely, than *lucta*, a *wrestling*, is the meaning of the πάλη,[5] a word occurring only here in the N. T., and evidently one specially *chosen* by the apostle (who elsewhere employs ἀγών or μάχη), with the view of bringing out the more strongly in connection with πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκ. the contrast between this less perilous form of contest and that which follows. Now, as the notion of the πάλη is not appropriate to the actual conflict of the Christians πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς κ.τ.λ., because it is not in keeping either with the πανοπλία in general or with its several constituent parts afterwards mentioned ver. 14 ff., but serves only to express what the Christian conflict is *not ;* after ἀλλά we have not mentally to supply again ἡ πάλη, but rather the *general* notion of kindred signification ἡ μάχη, "the battle," or μαχετέον, "one must fight,"[6] as frequently with Greek writers,[1] and in the N. T.[2] we have to derive from a preceding special notion an analogous more general one. What we have to sustain, Paul would say, is not the (less perilous) wrestling contest with blood and flesh, but we have to contend with the powers and authorities, etc. We have accordingly neither to say that with *πάλη* Paul only lighted in passing on another metaphor (my own former view), nor to suppose (the *usual* opinion) that he employed *πάλη* in the general sense of *certamen*, which, however, is only done in isolated poetic passages,[3] and hence we have the less reason to overlook the designed *choice* of the expression in our passage, or to depart from its proper signification. — *πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα*] *i.e.*, *against feeble men*, just as Gal. i. 16. Only here and Heb. ii. 14[4] does *αἷμα* stand first, which, however, is to be regarded as accidental. Matthies[5] understands *the lusts and desires having their root in one's own sensuous individuality*; but this idea must have been expressed by *πρὸς τὴν σάρκα* alone without *αἷμα* (Gal. v. 17, 24, *al.*), and is, moreover, at variance with the context, since the contrast is not with enemies *outside of us*, but with *superhuman superterrestrial* enemies. — *πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς*] This, as well as the following *πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας*, *designates* the *demons*, and that according to their *classes* (analogous to the classes of angels),[6] of which the *ἀρχαί* seem to be of higher rank than the *ἐξουσίαι* (see on i. 21), in which designation there is at the same time given the token of their *power*, and this their power is then in the two following clauses (*πρὸς τοὺς . . . ἐπουρανίοις*) characterized with regard to its *sphere* and to its *ethical quality*.[7] The exploded views, according to which *human* potentates of different kinds were supposed to be denoted by *ἀρχ.*, *ἐξουσ. κ.τ.λ.*, may be seen in Wolf. — *πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτ. τοῦ σκότ. τούτου*] *i.e.*, *against the rulers of the world*, *whose domain is the present darkness*. The *σκότος τοῦτο* is the *existing*, *present* darkness, which, namely, is characteristic of the *αἰὼν οὗτος*, and from which only believers are delivered, inasmuch as they have become *φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ*, *τέκνα τοῦ φωτός* (iv. 8, 9), being translated out of the domain opposed to divine truth into the possession of the same, and thus becoming themselves *ὡς φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ* (Phil. ii. 15). The reading *τοῦ σκότους τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* is a correct gloss. This pre-Messianic darkness is the *element* adverse to God, in which the *sway* of the world-ruling demons has its *essence and operation*, and without which their dominion would not take place. The devils are called *κοσμοκράτορες*,[8] because their dominion extends over the whole world, inasmuch as *all men* (the believers alone excepted, ii. 2) are subject to them. Thus Satan is called *ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*, 2 Cor. iv. 4, *ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*, John xii. 31, xvi. 11 (comp. John xiv. 30), and of the world it is said that *ὁ κόσμος ὅλος ἐν τῷ Πονηρῷ κεῖται*, 1 John v. 19. The Rabbins, too, adopted the word קוזמוקרטור, and employed it sometimes of kings, while they also say of the angel of death that God has made him *κοσμοκράτωρ*.[1] Later also the Gnostics called the devil by this name,[2] and in the *Testamentum Salomonis*[3] the demons say to Solomon : *ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν τὰ λεγόμενα στοιχεῖα, οἱ κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*, "we are the so-called principles of this world." The opinion that the compound has been weakened into the general signification *rulers*[4] is not susceptible of proof, and not to be supported by such Rabbinical passages as *Bresh. rabba*, sect. 58 f., 57. 1 : "Abrahamus persecutus quatuor, 'Abraham having persecuted the four,' *κοσμοκράτορας*," where *κοσμοκράτ.* denotes the *category* of the kings, and this *chosen* designation has the aim of *glorifying*. See also, in opposition to this alleged weakening, *Shir. R.* 3, 4 : "The *κοσμοκράτορες* are three kings : *dominates ab extremitate mundi ad extremitatem ejus*, Nebucadnezar, Evilmerodach, Belsazar," "ruling from one extremity of the world to the other, Nebuchadnezar, Evilmerodach, Belsazar." — *πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας*] *against the spirit-hosts of wickedness.* The adjective neuter, singular or plural, is collective, comprehending the beings in question according to their qualitative category as a corporate body, like *τὸ πολιτικόν*, the burgess-body ;[5] *τὸ ἱππικόν*, the cavalry ;[6] *τὰ λῃστρικά*, the robbers,[7] *τὰ δοῦλα, τὰ αἰχμάλωτα κ.τ.λ.*[8] Winer, p. 213, correctly compares *τὰ δαιμόνια* according to its original *adjectival* nature. — *τῆς πονηρίας*] genitivus *qualitatis*, "of quality," *characterizing* the spirit-hosts meant; *ἐπειδὴ γάρ εἰσι καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι πνεύματα, προσέθηκε τῆς πονηρίας*, "for since the angels also are spirits, he added *τῆς πονηρίας*," Theodoret. Moral wickedness is their essential quality ; hence the devil is pre-eminently *ὁ πονηρός*. The explanation *spirituales nequitias*, "spiritual wickedness,"[9] is impossible, since, if *τὰ πνευματικά* expressed the quality substantively and raised it to the position of subject,[10] we should have to analyze it as : *the spiritual nature*, or *the spiritual part*, *the spiritual side* of wickedness, all of which are unsuitable to the context. — *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*] Chrysostom, Theodoret, Photius, Oecumenius, Cajetanus, Castalio, Camerarius, Heinsius, Clarius, Calovius, Glass, Witsius, Wolf, Morus, Flatt, and others incorrectly render: *for the heavenly possessions*, so that it would indicate the object of the conflict, and *ἐν* would stand for *ὑπέρ* or *διά*. Against this view we may urge not the order of the words, since in fact this element pushed on *to the end* would be brought out with emphasis,[11] but certainly the *ἐν*, which does not mean *on account of*,[12] and *τὰ ἐπουράνια*, which in our Epistle is always meant in a *local* sense (see on i. 3). The view of Matthies is also incorrect, that it denotes the *place where* of the conflict: "in the kingdom of heaven, in which the Christians, as received into that kingdom, are also constantly contending against the enemies of God." τὰ ἐπουράνια does not signify the kingdom of heaven in the sense of Matthies, but *the heavenly regions*, heaven. Rückert, too, is incorrect, who likewise understands the *place where* of the conflict, holding that the contest is to be sustained, as not with flesh and blood, so also *not upon the same solid ground*, but *away in the air*, and is thus most strictly *mars iniquus*, "an unequal war." Apart from the oddness of this thought, according to it the contrast would in fact be one not of terrestrial and superterrestrial locality, but *of solid ground* and *baseless air*, so that Paul in employing ἐν τοῖς ἐπουραν. would have selected a quite inappropriate designation, and must have said ἐν τῷ ἀέρι. Baumgarten-Crusius gives us the choice between two incorrect interpretations: the *kingdom of spirits*, to which the kingdom of Christ too belongs, or the *affairs of that kingdom.* The *correct* connection is with τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας, so that it expresses the *seat* of the evil spirits.[1] This "*in the heavenly regions*" is not, however, in accordance with the context, to be understood of the abode of God, of Christ, and of the angels (iii. 10);[2] but, according to the popular view (comp. Matt. vi. 26)—in virtue of the flexible character of the conception "heaven," which embraces very different degrees of height (compare the conception of the seven heavens, 2 Cor. xii. 2)—of the *superterrestrial regions*, which, although still pertaining to the domain of the earth's atmosphere, yet relatively *appear* as heaven, so that in *substance* τὰ ἐπουράνια here denotes the same as ὁ ἀήρ, by which at ii. 2 the domain of the Satanic kingdom is accurately and properly designated.[3] This passage serves as a guide to the import of ours, which is wrongly denied by Hahn[4] on the basis of an erroneous interpretation of ἀήρ, ii. 2. According to the Rabbins, too, the lower of the seven heavens still fall within the region of the atmosphere.[5] And the *reason* why Paul does not here say ἐν τῷ ἀέρι is, that he wishes to bring out *as strongly as possible* the superhuman and superterrestrial nature of the hostile spirits, for which purpose to name *the air*, as the place of their dwelling might be less appropriate than to speak of *the heavenly regions*, an expression which

---

[1] See Kypke, II. p. 301. Comp. Thucyd. v. 104, and Poppo's note thereon.

[2] Cajetanus, Vatablus, Grotius, and others.

[3] Winer, p. 439 ff.

[4] Comp. already Augustine, *De verbo Dom.* 8 : "Non est nobis colluctatio adversus carnem et sanguinem, i.e., adversus homines, quos videtis saevire in nos. Vasa sunt, alius utitur ; organa sunt, alius tangit," "Our struggle is not against flesh and blood, *i.e.*, against men. They are vessels ; another uses them ; they are organs, another touches them."

[5] Hom. *Il.* xxiii. 635, 700 ff. ; Xen. *Mem.* iv. 8. 27 ; Plat. *Legg.* vii. 795 D ; and Ast, *ad Legg.* p. 378.

[6] Comp. Plato, *Soph.* p. 249 C : πρός γε τοῦτον παντὶ λόγῳ μαχετέον, "against this one must fight with every argument."

---

[1] See Döderlein, *de brachyl.* in his *Reden u. Aufs.* ii. p. 269 ff. Krüger, *Regist. zu Thucyd.*, p. 318.

[2] Buttmann, *Neutest. Gramm.* p. 336 [E. T. 392].

[3] Lycophr. 124, 1358.

[4] Lachmann, Tischendorf.

[5] So already Prudentius, Jerome, Cajetanus.

[6] "As every kingdom as such is inwardly organized, so also is the kingdom of the evil spirits," Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 347.

[7] Observe how in our passage every word rises up as a witness against all attempts to make of the devil a mere abstraction, a personified cosmic principle, and the like. Beyschlag too, *Christol. d. N. T.* p. 244 f. contests, without, however, at the time entering into a detailed argument, the personality of Satan, as of the world of angels and spirits in general, and regards him as the vital principle of matter, the self-seeking of nature, etc.

[8] Comp. *Orph. H.* viii. 11, xi. 11.

---

[1] See Schoettgen, *Horae*, p. 790 ; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talmud.* p. 2006 f. ; Wetstein, p. 259.

[2] Iren. i. 1.

[3] Fabricius, *Pseudepigr.* i. p. 1047.

[4] Harless.

[5] Herod. vii. 103.

[6] Rev. ix. 16.

[7] Polyaen. v. 14, 141.

[8] See Bernhardy, p. 326.

[9] Erasmus, Beza, Castalio, Clarius, Zeger, Cornelius à Lapide, Wolf, and others.

[10] See Matthiae, p. 994 ; Kühner, II. p. 122.

[11] Kühner, II. p. 625.

[12] Where it is rendered so according to the approximate sense, the analysis follows another course. See on Matt. vi. 7 ; John xvi. 30 ; Acts vii. 29 ; 2 Cor. ix. 4.

---

[1] So Jerome, Ambrosiaster, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Vatablus, Estius, Grotius, Erasmus Schmid, Bengel, Koppe, and many, including Usteri, Meier, Holzhausen, Harless, Olshausen, de Wette, Bleek.

[2] In opposition to Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 345.

[3] Comp. Philippi, *Glaubensl.* III. p. 309 f. Prudentius has already, *Hamartigenia*, 513 ff., in a poetic paraphrase of our passage, correctly apprehended the meaning:

"Sed cum spiritibus tenebrosis nocte dieque
Congredimur, quorum dominatibus humidus iste
Et pigris densus nebulis obtemperat aër.
Scilicet hoc medium coelum inter et infima terrae,
Quod patet ac vacuo nubes suspendit hiatu,
Frena potestatum variarum sustinet ac sub
Principe Belial rectoribus horret iniquis.
His conluctamur praedonibus, ut sacra nobis
Oris apostolici testis sententia prodit."

Comp. Photius, *Quaest. Amphil.* 144. — According to *Ascens. Isa.* 10, it is the *firmamentum*, in which the devil dwells.

[4] *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 336 f.

[5] See Wetstein, *ad* 2 *Cor.* xii. 2.

entirely accords with the lively *coloring* of his picture.[1] Semler and Storr, ignoring this significant bearing and suitableness of the expression, have arbitrarily imported a *formerly*, as though the *previous* abode of the demons had any connection with the matter ! Schenkel has even imported the *irony of a paradox*, which has the design of making the assumption of divine power and glory on the part of the demons ridiculous, as though anything of the sort were at all in keeping with the whole profound seriousness of our passage, or could have been recognized by any reader whatever ! Hofmann finally[2] has, after a rationalizing fashion, transformed the simple direct statement of place into the thought : "not limited to this or that locality of the earthly world, but overruling the same, as the heavens encircle the earth." The thought of this turn so easily made, Paul would have known how to *express*—even though he had but said : τὰ ὄντα ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, or more clearly : τὰ ὄντα πανταχοῦ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν. The absence of a connective article is not at all opposed to our interpretation, since τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις might the more be combined into *one idea*, as it was the counterpart of such spirits upon earth. Comp. τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι, 1 Tim. vi. 17, and see on ii. 11, iii. 10. [See Note LIX., p. 557 seq.] — The πρός, four times occurring after ἀλλά, has rhetorical emphasis, as it needed to be used but once.[3] — As at ii. 2, so here also, *Gnosticism* is found by Baur in expression and conception, because, forsooth, Marcion and the Valentinians designated the devil as the κοσμοκράτωρ, and the demoniac powers as τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας.[4] This is the *inverting* method of critical procedure.

Ver. 13. Διὰ τοῦτο] because we have to fight against *these* powers. — ἀναλάβετε] the usual word for the *taking up of armor*.[5] The opposite : κατατίθημι. — ἀντιστῆναι] namely, the assaults of the demons. — ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πονηρᾷ] *The evil day* means here, according to the context, neither the *present life*,[6] nor the *day of death*,[7] nor the *day of judgment* ;[8] nor yet, as most expositors suppose, in general, *the day of conflict and of peril, which the devil prepares for us*,[9] for *every* day was such, whereas the evil day here manifestly appears as a *peculiar* and *still future* day, for the conflict of which the readers were to arm themselves. Hence also not : *every day*, *on which the devil has special power* ;[10] but the emphatic designation ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ πονηρά could suggest to the reader only a single, κατ' ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminently," morally evil, day well known to him, and that is *the day in which the Satanic power* (ὁ Πονηρός) *puts forth its last and greatest outbreak*, which last outbreak of the anti-Christian kingdom Paul expected shortly before the Parousia.[1] [See Note LX., p. 558.] Comp. also the ἐνεστὼς αἰὼν πονηρός, Gal. i. 4, and the remark thereon. — καὶ ἅπαντα κατεργασάμενοι στῆναι] This στῆναι corresponds to the preceding ἀντιστῆναι, of which it is the *result;* and in the midst, between ἀντιστῆναι and στῆναι, lies ἅπαντα κατεργασ. : "*to withstand in the evil day, and, after you shall have accomplished all things, to stand.*" The latter expression is the designation of the victor, who, after the fight is finished, is not laid prostrate, or put to flight, but *stands.*[2] What is meant by ἅπαντα, is necessarily yielded by the connection, namely, *everything which belongs to the conflict in question*, the whole work of the combat in all its parts and actions. The κατεργάζεσθαι retains its ordinary signification *peragere, conficere consummare*, "to achieve, accomplish, complete,"[3] and is not, with Oecumenius, Theophylact, Camerarius, Beza, Grotius, Calovius, Kypke, Koppe, Flatt, Holzhausen, Harless, Olshausen, de Wette, Bleek, and others, to be taken in the sense of *debellare, overpower*, in which sense it is, like the German *abthun* and *niedermachen* and the Latin *conficere*, usual enough,[4] but is never so employed by Paul—frequently as the word occurs with him—or elsewhere in the N. T., and here would only be required by the text, if ἅπαντας were the reading.[5] De Wette objects to our interpretation as being tame. This, however, it is not, and the less so, because κατεργάζεσθαι is the *characteristic* word for a great and difficult work,[6] and ἅπαντα also is *purposely chosen.*[7] To be rejected also is the construction of Erasmus, Beza,[8] Calixtus, Morus, Rosenmüller, and others : "*omnibus rebus probe comparatis ad pugnam*," "all things being well prepared for the battle."[9] This would be παρασκευασάμενοι (1 Cor. xiv. 8), and what a redundant thought would thus result, especially since στῆναι would then be not at all different from ἀντιστῆναι ! Lastly, the translation of the Vulgate, which is best attested critically*; in omnibus perfecti*, "in all things perfect,"[10] is not to be regarded, with Estius, as the sense of our reading, but expresses the reading κατειργασμένοι, which is, moreover, to be found in a vitiated form (κατεργασμένοι) in codex A. Erasmus conjectured a corruption of the *Latin* codices.

---

[1] Entirely uncalled for, therefore, and less in keeping with the coloring of the passage, would be the alteration already discussed in Photius, *Quaest. Amphiloch.* 94, whereby, namely, τίνες had changed the ἐπουρανίοις into ὑπουρανίοις—a conjecture approved by Erasmus, Beza, and Grundling (in Wolf). Luther, who translates "*under* the heaven," probably did so, not as taking ἐν for ὑπό,—like Alting subsequently (in Wolf),—but *by way of explanation*. Already in Homer οὐρανός is, as is well known, employed of the higher *region of air* (*under* the firmament). See Nägelsbach, *Hom. Theol.* p. 19.

[2] *Schriftbeweis*, I. p. 455.

[3] Comp. Dem. 842, 7 : πρὸς παίδων, πρὸς γυναικῶν, πρὸς τῶν ὄντων ὑμῖν ἀγαθῶν, Winer, p. 374 ; Buttmann, *Neutest. Gramm.* p. 341 [E. T. 398].

[4] Iren. i. 5. 4, i. 28. 2.

[5] See Kypke and Wetstein.

[6] Chrysostom, Oecumenius, who at the same time believed βραχὺν τὸν τοῦ πολεμοῦ καιρόν, "the brief time of the battle," to be hinted at.

[7] Erasmus Schmid.

[8] Jerome.

[9] So also Rückert, Harless, Matthies, Meier, Winzer, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Bleek.

[10] Bengel, Zachariae, Olshausen.

Ver. 14. *In what manner they accordingly*, clad conformably to the preceding requirement in the πανοπλία τοῦ Θεοῦ, *are to stand forth.* — στῆτε] is not again, like the preceding στῆναι, the standing of the victor, but the *standing*

---

[1] See Usteri, *Lehrbegriff*, p. 348 ff.

[2] Comp. Xen. *Anab.* i. 10. 1.

[3] Comp. van Hengel, *ad. Rom.* I. p. 205.

[4] See Kypke, II. p. 301.

[5] Koppe felt this, hence he viewed ἅπαντα as *masculine*, in accordance with Kypke's proposal! Even in those passages which Kypke adduces for κατεργάζεσθαι πάντα, instead of κατεργ. πάντας, πάντα is to be left in the *neuter sense*, and κατεργ. is *to complete, to execute.* Freely, but correctly in accordance with the sense, Luther renders: "that ye may perform all well, and keep the field."

[6] Herod. v. 24; Plato, *Legg.* iii. p. 686 E, *al.;* and see Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 107.

[7] *All without exception;* see Valckenaer, *Schol.* I. p. 339.

[8] Who proposes this explanation alongside of the rendering *prostratis*, "overthrown," and is inclined to regard it as the better one.

[9] Bengel.

[10] Comp. Lucifer, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius.

forth of the man ready for the combat. Besides Isa. lix. 17, Wisd. v. 17 ff., see also Rabbinical passages for the figurative reference of particular weapons to the means of spiritual conflict, in Schoettgen, *Horae*, p. 791 f. — *περιζωσάμενοι τὴν ὀσφύν*] *having your loins girt about.* Comp. Isa. xi. 5. For the singular *τ. ὀσφ.*, comp. Eur. *Electr.* 454 : *ταχυπόρος πόδα* [quick of foot], and see Elmsley, *ad Eur. Med.* 1077. The *girdle* or *belt*[1] is first mentioned by the apostle, because to have put on this was the first and most essential requirement of the warrior standing armed ready for the fight ; to speak of a well-equipped warrior without a girdle is a *contradictio in adjecto*, for it was just the girdle which produced the free bearing and movement and the necessary attitude of the warrior. Hence it is not to be assumed, with Harless, that Paul thought of the girdle as an *ornament*. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 13. — *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*] instrumental. *With truth* they are to be girt about, *i.e.*, *truth is to be their girdle.* Comp. Isa. xi. 5. As for the actual warrior the whole *aptus habitus*, "prepared state," for the combat (this is the *tertium comparationis*, "point of comparison"), would be wanting in the absence of the girdle ; so also for the spiritual warrior, if he is not furnished with truth. From this it is at once clear that *ἀλήθεια* is not to be taken *objectively*, of the *gospel*, which, on the contrary, is only designated later, ver. 17, by *ῥῆμα Θεοῦ* ; but *subjectively*, of truth as inward property, *i.e.*, *harmony of knowledge with the objective truth given in the gospel.* The explanation *sincerity*[2] is, as expressive only of a single virtue, according to the context too narrow (compare the following *δικαιοσύνη, πίστις κ.τ.λ.*), and the notion, moreover, would merge into that of the following *δικαιοσύνη*, an objection which applies likewise to the explanation *Christian integrity.*[3]— *τὴν θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσ.*] Genitivus *appositionis*, "appositive genitive."[4] As the actual warrior has protected the breast, when he "*θώρηκα περὶ στήθεσσιν ἔδυνεν*," "has put the plate about the breast," so with you *δικαιοσύνη* is to be that, which renders your breast (heart and will) inaccessible to the hostile influences of the demons. *δικαιοσύνη* is here *Christian moral rectitude* (Rom. vi. 13), inasmuch as, justified through faith, we are *dead to sin and live ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς* (Rom. vi. 4). Harless and Winzer understand *the righteousness by faith*, by which, however, inasmuch as this righteousness is given with faith, the *θυρεὸς τῆς πίστεως*, subsequently singled out quite specially, is anticipated. [See Note LXI., p. 558.] As previously the *intellectual* rectitude of the Christian was denoted by *ἀλήθεια*, so here his *moral* rectitude by *δικαιοσύνη*.

Ver. 15. And the service which the *ὑποδήματα*, the *military sandals*,[5] render to the actual warrior, enabling him, namely, to advance against the enemy with agile and sure step, the *ἑτοιμασία τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς εἰρήνης* is to render to you spiritual warriors, inasmuch as by virtue of it you march briskly and firmly against the Satanic powers.—*ὑποδησάμενοι κ.τ.λ.*] *having*

---

[1] *ζωστήρ*, covering the loins and the part of the body below the breastplate, also called *ζώνη*, Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VIII. p. 177, not to be confounded with *ζῶμα*, the lower part of the coat of mail.

[2] Calvin, Boyd, Estius, Olshausen, Bisping, and others.

[3] Morus, Winzer.

[4] Comp. 1 Thess. v. 8 ; Wisd. v. 19 ; Soph. *O. R.* 170 : φροντίδος ἔγχος.

[5] Xen. *Anab.* iv. 5. 14 [Josephus, *B. J.* vi. 1. 8] (*caligae*, compare the Heb. סְאוֹן, Isa. ix. 4 ; see Gesenius, *Thes.* II. 932 ; Bynaeus, *de calc. Hebr.* p 83 f.

your feet underbound with the preparedness of the gospel of peace. ἐν does not stand for εἰς,[1] but is instrumental, as in ver. 14, so that the ἑτοιμασία is conceived of as the *foot-clothing itself*. Beza well remarks: "non enim vult nos docere dumtaxat, oportere nos esse calceatos, sed calceos etiam, ut ita loquar, nobis praebet," "For he does not wish only to teach us that we ought to be shod, but, so to say, offers us the very sandals."—*ἑτοιμασία*[2] is *preparedness*,[3] whether it be an *outward* standing ready,[4] or an *inward* being ready, *promptitudo animi*, "readiness of mind." So LXX. Ps. x. 17, comp. ἑτοίμη ἡ καρδία, Ps. lvii. 7, cxii. 7, where the LXX. indicate the notion of a prepared mind, which is expressed in Hebrew by forms of the stem כּוּן, by the use of ἑτοιμασία and ἕτοιμος, following the signification of *making ready*, *adjusting*, which כּוּן has in all the conjugations of it which occur (Deut. xxxii. 6 ; Ps. viii. 4 ; Gen. xliii. 16 ; Prov. xix. 29 ; Neh. viii. 10 ; Ps. lix. 5), alongside of the signification of laying down, establishing, from which the former one is derived. Hence the LXX. translate מָכוֹן too[5] by ἑτοιμασία ; not as though in their usage ἑτοιμασία *signified* foundation, which it never does, but because they *understood* מָכוֹן in the sense of ἑτοιμασία. So Ezra ii. 68, where the house of God is to be erected upon τὴν ἑτοιμασίαν αὐτοῦ, *upon the preparation thereof*, *i.e.*, upon the foundation already lying prepared. So also Ezra iii. 3 ; Ps. lxxxix. 15 ; Dan. xi. 20, 21. Wrongly, therefore, have Wolf (after the older expositors), Bengel, Zachariae, Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Bleek, and others, explained ἑτοιμασία by *fundamentum* or *firmitas*, "foundation or firmness ;" so that Paul is supposed to indicate "vel constantiam in tuenda religione Christi, vel religionem adeo ipsam, certam illam quidem et fundamento, cui insistere possis, similem," "either constancy in keeping the religion of Christ, or that very religion itself, like a foundation whereon you can stand," Koppe. This is not only contrary to linguistic usage (see above), but also opposed to the context, since the notion does not suit the figurative conception of putting on shoes (ὑποδησάμ.). It is the *readiness*, the ready mind ; not, however, *for the proclamation of the gospel*,[6] —since, in fact, Paul is speaking to fellow-*Christians*, not to fellow-*teachers*,—but the *promptitudo*, "readiness"—and that for the conflict in question—*which the gospel bestows*, which is produced by means of it. So Oecumenius (who has this interpretation alongside the former one), Calvin, Castalio, and others, including Matthies, Holzhausen, Harless, Olshausen, Winzer, de Wette, Schenkel. The explanation of Schleusner : "instar pedum armaturae sit vobis *doctrina salutaris* . . . *quae*

---

[1] Vulgate, Erasmus, Vatablus, and others.

[2] With classical writers ἑτοιμότης, Dem. 1268, 7, but see also Hippocr. p. 24, 47.

[3] In Wisd. xiii. 12 it means *making ready* (food). The Vulg. translates it in our passage *in praeparatione* (comp. Artemid. ii. 57).

[4] Josephus, *Antt.* x. 1. 2 : δισχιλίους ἐκ τῆς ἐμοὶ παρούσης ἵππους εἰς ἑτοιμασίαν ὑμῖν παρέχειν ἕτοιμος εἰμι, "I am ready to afford you two thousand cavalry of that of mine present."

[5] *Foundation*, as Ps. lxxxix. 15.

[6] So, in some instances with a reference to Isa. lii. 7, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Pelagius, Erasmus, Luther, Vatablus, Clarius, Cornelius à Lapide, Erasmus Schmid, Estius, Grotius, Calovius, Calixtus, Michaelis, and others, including Rückert, Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius.

vobis semper in promptu sit," "Let the saving doctrine be to you like an equipment of the feet which may always be in readiness," is to be rejected on account of ver. 17, according to which the gospel is the *sword*. — *τῆς εἰρήνης*] *Subject-matter* of the gospel, and that purposely designated in harmony with the context. For the gospel proclaims *peace κατ' ἐξοχήν*, "pre-eminently," *i.e.*, the inner peace with God, Rom. v. 1, Phil. i. 20, and produces precisely thereby consecration of courageous readiness for the *conflict* in question (Rom. viii. 31, 38, 39). At variance with the context, Erasmus, *Paraphr.*, makes it: "evangelium, quod non tumultu, sed *tolerantia tranquillitateque defenditur*," "the gospel which is defended, not by tumult, but by tolerance and tranquillity;" and Michaelis holds: the peace *between Jews and Gentiles* is meant. If, however, it is taken, with Koppe and Morus, in accordance with the more extended sense of שָׁלוֹם (comp. Rom. x. 15), the *salvation-bringing* (rather: the *salvation-proclaiming*, comp. i. 13) gospel, this is done without any justification from the text, and to the injury of the special coloring of the several particulars. Winzer, finally, contrary to the unity of the sense, combines peace with God *and* everlasting salvation.

Ver. 16. Ἐπὶ πᾶσιν] not: *before all things*,[1] but: *in addition to all*.[2] By the three pieces previously mentioned, vv. 14, 15 (which were all made fast to the body), the body is clothed upon for warlike purposes; what is still wanting, and must be added to all that has preceded, is shield, helmet, sword, vv. 16, 17. — *τὸν θυρεόν*] *θυρεός*, which Polybius mentions and more fully describes as the first part of the Roman *πανοπλία* (vi. 23. 2 ff.), is, with Homer, that which is placed in front of the doorway and blocks the entrance,[3] and only with later writers[4] is the *shield*,[5] and that the *scutum*, the large shield, 4 feet in length and 2½ feet in width, as distinguished from the small round buckler, *clypeus*, *ἀσπίς*.[6] Paul does not say *ἀσπίς*, because he is representing the Christian warrior as *heavy-armed*. — *τῆς πίστεως*] Genitivus *appositionis*, "appositive genitive," as *τῆς δικαιοσύνης*, ver. 14. The faith, however, is not the faith of miracles,[7] but the *fides salvifica*, "saving faith" (ii. 8), by which the Christian is assured of the forgiveness of his sins on account of the sacrificial death of Christ, and at the same time is assured of the Messianic blessedness (i. 7, ii. 5 ff., iii. 12), has the Holy Spirit as the earnest of everlasting life (i. 13, 14), and consequently has Christ in the heart (ii. 17; Gal. ii. 20), and as child of God (i. 5; Rom. viii. 15 f.; Gal. iv. 5 ff.) under the government of grace (Rom. viii. 14) belongs so wholly to God (Rom. vi. 11; comp. 1 John iii. 7 ff.), that he cannot be separated by anything from the love of God towards him (Rom. viii. 38); and on his part is consecrated only to the service of God (i. 4; Rom. vii. 4, 6, vi. 22), and hence through God carries off the victory over the power of Satan opposed to God (Rom.

---

[1] Luther, Castalio, Michaelis, and others.

[2] Comp. Luke iii. 20; Polyb. vi. 23. 12: ἐπὶ δὲ πᾶσι τούτοις προσεπικοσμοῦνται πτερίνῳ στεφάνῳ, "In addition to all these, they are adorned with a feather garland." See Wetstein, *ad Luc.* xvi. 26; Matthiae, p. 1371.

[3] *Od.* ix. 240, 313.

[4] Plutarch, Strabo, etc.

[5] See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 336, and Wetstein, *ad loc.*

[6] See Lipsius, *de milit. Rom.* iii. 2, ed. Plant. 1614, p. 106 ff.; Alberti and Kypke *in loc.*; Ottii *Spicileg.* p. 409 f. Comp. the Homeric σάκος and the Hebrew צִנָּה.

[7] Chrysostom.

xvi. 20 ; 2 Thess. iii. 3). Only wavering faith is accessible to the devil (2 Cor. xi. 3; comp. 1 Pet. v. 8, 9). — ἐν ᾧ] *by means of which, i.e.*, by holding it in front. — δυνήσεσθε] for the conflict in question is *future.* See on vv. 12, 13. — τοῦ πονηροῦ] of the morally evil one κατ' ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminently," *i.e.*, *the devil;* 2 Thess. iii. 3 ; Matt. v. 37, vi. 13, xiii. 19, 38 ; John xvii. 15 ; 1 John v. 19. — τὰ[1] πεπυρωμένα] *those set on fire, the burning ones.*[2] The *malleoli* are meant, *i.e.*, arrows tipped with inflammable material (tow, pitch) and shot off after being kindled, which, known also to the Hebrews (see expositors on Ps. vii. 14), were in use among the Greeks and Romans, and are to be distinguished from the javelins of the same kind.[3] For the description of the *malleoli*, see Ammian. Marcell. xxiii. 4 ; and see, in general, Lydius, *Agonist.* p. 45, *de re mil.* p. 119, 315 ; Spanheim, *ad Julian. Orat.* p. 193. *Poisoned* arrows[4] are not meant,[5] since these *are* not on fire (πεπυρωμένα), but *excite* a fire (inflammation). The *aim* of the predicate, we may add, is to present in strong colors the *hostile and destructive* character of the Satanic assaults ; but more special explanations of its import, such as of the *burning desires* excited by Satan,[6] or of *doubts* and of the anguish of despair[7] are inappropriate ; and the more so, inasmuch as in the whole context the apostle is speaking of diabolic assaults in general, not of particular kinds thereof. — σβέσαι] The shields of the Greeks and Romans were as a rule of wood, with a thick coating of leather.[8] So Paul conceives of faith under the figure of such a shield, which not only prevents the missiles from injuring the warrior, but also by reason of its coating brings it about that these do not set on fire the wood of the shield, but must needs be themselves extinguished, so that thus the warrior, by holding the shield in front of him, *can quench* the fiery arrows.

Ver. 17. We have to prefix not a *full stop*, as is done by Lachmann and Tischendorf, seeing that ver. 18 has reference to the whole from στῆτε onward, vv. 14–17 (see on ver. 18), but only a *comma*. Paul, namely, passes over from the participial construction into that of the *verbum finitum*, "finite verb," as at i. 20,—a change to which he was drawn by the increasing vivacity of his figurative conception, which, moreover, induced him now to prefix the *object* (περικεφαλαίαν and μάχαιραν, ver. 17). — In natural sequence he brings forward *first* the taking of the helmet, and *then* that of the sword ; because the left hand already grasps the shield (ver. 16), and thus after the taking of the sword there is no hand free. — τοῦ σωτηρίου] again genitive *of apposition*. *The salvation, i.e.*, the salvation κατ' ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminently," *the salvation of the Messianic kingdom*, of which the Christian is partaker (*before* the

---

[1] The article implies that Satan discharges *other* arrows besides burning ones. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* iv. 6. 1.

[2] Comp. Apollod. *Bibl.* ii. 5. 2 ; Leo, *Tact.* xv. 27, ed. Heyn. ; also πυρφόροι ὀϊστοί in Thucyd. ii. 75. 4 ; βέλη πυρφόρα, Diod. xx. 96 ; Zosim. *Hist.* p. 256, 2.

[3] *Falaricae*, see Vegetius, iv. 8.

[4] *Od.* i. 260 f. ; Virg. *Aen.* ix. 773 ; Ps. xxxviii. 3 ; Job vi. 4 ; and see Lyd. *de re mil.* p. 118.

[5] As supposed by Boyd, Hammond, Bochart.

[6] Chrysostom, Theophylact ; comp. Oecumenius.

[7] Boyd.

[8] Hom. *Il.* v. 452 ; Herod. vii. 91 ; Polyb. *l.c.* ; Plin. viii. 39 ; and see, in general, Lipsius, *de milit. Rom.* iii. 2, p. 109 ff.

Parousia, as an *ideal* possession, Rom. viii. 24 [1]), serves, appropriated in his consciousness, to protect him against the assaults of the devil aimed at his everlasting life, like the helmet, which defends the warrior from deadly wounds on the head.[2] For the use of σωτήριον as a substantive, comp. Luke ii. 20, iii. 6 ; Acts xxviii. 28 ; frequently met with in the classics and the LXX. ; see Schleusner, *Thes. sub voce.* Neither *Christ Himself* [3] nor the gospel [4] is meant. It is true that the word σωτήριον is not elsewhere used by Paul ; but here it is explained as a reminiscence from the LXX. Isa. lix. 17. — δέξασθε] *receive*, namely, from God (ver. 13), who offers you this helmet.— τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος] The genitive *cannot* here be appositional,[5] since there follows the explanation ὅ ἐστι ῥῆμα Θεοῦ, from which it is clear that the sword of the Spirit is not the Spirit itself, but something distinct therefrom, namely, *the word of God* (comp. Heb. iv. 12).[6] If Paul had wished to designate the Spirit itself as sword, the explanation ὅ ἐστι ῥῆμα Θεοῦ would have deen inappropriate, inasmuch as the *word of God* and the *Holy Spirit* are different things ;[7] in Romans, too, πνεῦμα means nothing else than the Holy Spirit. The μάχαιρα τοῦ πνεύμ. is *the sword, which the Holy Spirit furnishes* (comp. τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, vv. 11, 13), and this sword is the word of God, the gospel (comp. on v. 26), the contents of which the Spirit brings vividly to the consciousness of the Christian, in order that he may defend himself by the divine power of the gospel (Rom. i. 16) against the assaults of the diabolic powers, and may vanquish them, as the warrior wards off and vanquishes the enemy with the sword. *Limitations* of the ῥῆμα Θεοῦ, either to the *commandments* of God,[8] or to the divine *threatenings against the enemies of the Christians*,[9] are as arbitrary and inappropriate as is the explaining τοῦ πνεύματος of the *human* spirit,[10] or by πνευματικήν,[11] which, according to Grotius, is to serve "*molliendis translationibus*," "for rendering the transfers less abrupt," but yet would have again to be explained by τοῦ πνεύματος in the sense of the *Holy* Spirit. — ὅ ἐστι] applying, according to the ordinary attraction, to τὴν μάχαιραν. Olshausen, in accordance with his erroneous conception of τοῦ πνεύματος, refers it to the latter. So already Basil, *contr. Eunom.* 11, who proves from our passage that not only the Son, but also the Spirit is the Word !

REMARK ON VV. 14–17.—In the exposition of these several portions of the armor of the spiritual warrior, it is just as unwarrantable to press the comparisons, by pursuing the *points of comparison* into such *particular details* as it may please us to select from the various uses of the pieces of armor in question (an error which several of the older expositors committed),—whereby free room is given for the play of subjectivity, and the vivid objective delineation of the apostle's figure is arbitrarily broken up,—as it is, on the other hand, arbitrary to disregard the differences in the figures derived from military equipment, and to say : "*universa potius armorum notio* tenenda est," "rather the entire notion of arms must be retained" (Winzer, *l.c.* p. 14 ; comp. Morus, Rosenmüller, and others). The essential characteristic—the specific main point—whereby the pieces named are distinguished from each other in respect of that for which they serve, must be furnished by the nature of the comparison with the respective means of spiritual conflict ; so that Paul must have been *conscious why* he *here* designated, *e.g.*, δικαιοσύνη as the breastplate, faith as the shield, etc., namely, inasmuch as he looked at the former really from the point of view of the essential *destination* of the breastplate, the latter from that of the essential *destination* of the shield, etc. Otherwise his representation would be a play of figures, of which the separate images, so different in themselves, would have no basis in the *conception* of what is *represented*. To this there is nothing opposed in the fact that *here* δικαιοσύνη appears as the breastplate, while at 1 Thess. v. 8 it is faith and love which so appear ; for the figurative mode of regarding the subject can by no means, with a mind so many-sided, rich, and versatile as that of St. Paul, be so stereotyped that the very same thing which he has here viewed under the figure of the protecting breastplate, must have presented itself another time under this very same figure. Thus, *e.g.*, there appears to him, as an offering well-pleasing to God, at one time Christ (Eph. v. 2), at another the gifts of love received (Phil. iv. 18), at another time the bodies of Christians (Rom. xii. 1) ; under the figure of the seed-corn, at one time the body becoming buried (1 Cor. xv. 36 f.), at another time the moral conduct (Gal. vi. 7) ; under the figure of the leaven, once moral corruption (1 Cor. v. 6), another time doctrinal corruption (Gal. v. 9) ; under the figure of clothing which is put on, once the new man (iv. 24), another time Christ (Gal. iii. 27), at another time the body (2 Cor. v. 3), and other similar instances.

---

[1] Hence Paul in 1 Thess. v. 8 says : περικεφαλαίαν ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας, which, however, does not justify in our passage the explanation *hope of salvation*, given to it by Cajetanus, Calvin, Zanchius, Boyd, Estius, Grotius, Calixtus, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Meier, Winzer, and others.

[2] As to the Roman *helmets*, see Lipsius, *de milit. Rom.* iii. 5, p. 122 ff.

[3] Theodoret, Bengel.

[4] Holzhausen.

[5] In opposition to Harless, Olshausen, Schenkel, and older expositors.

[6] Comp. also Bleek.

[7] It is true Olshausen observes that the Word as to its inner essence is *Spirit*, as the efflux of God the Spirit. But that is a *quid pro quo ;* for the word would not here be termed *Spirit* (as John vi. 63), but *the Spirit*, *i.e.*, the *Holy Spirit Himself.* A like *quid pro quo* is made by Schenkel, namely, that the word of God is the most adequate *expression* of the absolute Spirit (John iv. 24).

[8] Flatt.

[9] Koppe.

[10] Morus, Rosenmüller.

[11] Grotius, Michaelis, and others ; comp. already Chrysostom and Erasmus.

Ver. 18. After Paul has, vv. 14–17, placed before his readers in what armor they are to stand forth, he shows yet further how this standing ready for the combat *must be combined with prayer :* "with prayer and entreaty of every kind, praying at each moment in virtue of the Spirit." These are two parallel specifications of mode, whereof the second more precisely defines the first, and which stand in grammatical and logical connection with στῆτε οὖν, ver. 14 ; not with the intervening δέξασθε, ver. 17, which rather is itself subordinate to the στῆτε, and only by a deviation from the construction has come to be expressed in the imperative instead of the participle, wherefore στῆτε οὖν remains the precept *ruling* the whole description, vv. 14–17. Should we join them to δέξασθε, neither πάσης nor ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ would be appropriate to this *momentary* act ; for we would, in fact, be told not how the sword of the Spirit should be *handled*,[1] but how it should be *taken!* An *imperative* signification[1] the participle has not. — διὰ πάσης προσευχ. κ. δεήσ.] is to be taken by itself, not to be joined to the following προσευχόμ.,[2] since otherwise a tautological redundancy of expression would arise (not to be confounded with the mode of expression προσευχῇ προσεύχεσθαι, Jas. v. 17),—arbitrarily conjectured by de Wette to have been occasioned by Phil. iv. 6,—and because it is an impossibility to pray διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ.[3] διά here denotes "*conditionem, in qua* locatus aliquid vel facias vel patiaris," "a condition, fixed in which you either do, or suffer something,"[4] *i.e., while ye employ every kind of prayer and entreaty*, omit no sort of prayer and entreaty. Those who join with προσευχόμ. take διά as *by means of*. But see above. The expression πάσης προσευχ. receives its elucidation from the following ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ, inasmuch as to different circumstances of the time different kinds of prayer, as respects contents and form, are appropriate. προσευχή and δέησις are distinguished not so, that the former applies to the obtaining of a blessing, the latter to the averting of an evil[5]—a meaning which, quite without proof from the linguistic usage of the single words, is derived merely from the combination of the two; but rather as *prayer* and *entreaty*, of which only the former has the sacred character and may be of any tenor; the latter, on the other hand, may be addressed not merely to God, as here, but also to men, and is supplicatory in tenor.[6] — ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ] *at every season*, not merely under special circumstances and on particular occasions. Comp. Luke xxi. 36. It is the ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθαι, 1 Thess. v. 17, ii. 13, i. 3; Rom. i. 9. — ἐν πνεύματι] understood of the *human* spirit (Rom. viii. 10), would denote the *heartfelt* prayer in contrast to the mere utterance of the lips.[7] But this contrast was so obvious of itself, that such a description of prayer would be quite out of place in the flow of the passage before us, accumulating, as it does, simply elements that are specifically Christian. *The Holy Spirit* is meant (ver. 17), by virtue of whom the Christian is to pray. See Rom. viii. 15, 26; Gal. iv. 6. [See Note LXII., p. 558.] — καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ ἀγρυπν. κ.τ.λ.] attaches to the general προσευχόμενοι ἐν π. κ. ἐν πν. something *special*, namely, *intercession*, and that for all Christians, and in particular for the apostle himself: *and in that ye on this behalf are watchful in every kind of perseverance and entreaty for all saints and for me*, etc. According to de Wette, εἰς αὐτὸ ἀργ. is to be held as still belonging to the general exhortation to prayer, and ἐν π. προσκαρτ. κ.τ.λ. to be the addition of a special element, like ἐν εὐχαρ., Col. iv. 2. But how idly would κ. εἰς αὐτὸ ἀγρ. then be used, seeing that the *continual* praying is already before so urgently expressed! Moreover, καί betrays the transition to a *new* element of prayer. — εἰς αὐτό] *in reference thereto, on behalf of this*, namely, of the προσεύχεσθαι ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἐν πνεύματι just required. By αὐτό, namely, is denoted *that which is just being spoken of*, and it is distinguished from αὐτὸ τοῦτο (the *Recepta*) only in this respect, that the latter (comp. on Rom. ix. 17) designates the subject in question at the same time demonstratively, and so still more definitely.[1] According to Holzhausen,[2] it has reference to ἵνα μοι δοθῇ. But in that case εἰς τοῦτο must have been written; and, moreover, περὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων would be from a logical point of view opposed to it. — ἐν πάσῃ προσκαρτ. κ. δεήσει περὶ π. τ. ἁγ.] denotes the *domain*, wherein, etc. On behalf of the required προσεύχεσθαι they are to be watchful *in every kind of perseverance and entreaty for all saints.* The προσκαρτέρησις is, according to the context (and comp. Col. iv. 2), the perseverance *in prayer*, so that ἐν π. προσκ. corresponds to the διὰ πάσ. προσευχῆς at the beginning of the verse, and then with καὶ (ἐν πάσῃ) δεήσει, as there, the *entreaty* attaches itself, but now with the more precise definition: περὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων, which hence belongs not to προσκαρτ., but only to δεήσει, as, indeed, accordingly the latter may not be amalgamated with προσκαρτ. into a ἓν διὰ δυοῖν. According to Rückert, ἐν πάσῃ προσκαρτ. κ. δεήσει is added, in order to be able to annex περὶ πάντ. τ. ἁγ. But in that case could not Paul have written merely εἰς αὐτὸ ἀγρυπν. περὶ πάντ. τ. ἁγ., and that without risk of being misunderstood? No, the ἐν πάσῃ προσκ. κ. δεήσ., in itself not essential, gives to his discourse the emphasis of earnestness and solemnity.[3] — πάσῃ] as previously πάσης.

---

[1] Olshausen ; comp. Harless : "the temper in which they are *to wield* such weapons."

---

[1] Bleek.

[2] So *usually*, as also by Rückert, Matthies, Harless, Bleek; not Meier and Baumgarten-Crusius.

[3] The case would be otherwise, and this impossibility would not exist, if it were said: διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς κ. δεήσ. καὶ ἐν π. καιρῷ.

[4] Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 138; Winer, p. 339.

[5] Grotius and many.

[6] See Harless on the passage, and Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 372 f.

[7] Castalio, Zanchius, Erasmus Schmid, Grotius, Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, and others.

Ver. 19. Καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ] καί: *and in particular.*[4] The special point which, in connection with the intercession embracing all Christians, he would have to be made matter of supplication *for himself*, is stated in what follows. ὑπέρ expresses, as previously the περί in current use, the sense *in commodum*, "for the advantage of;"[5] and only the form of sensuous perception, which underlies the two prepositions, is different, as in the case of the Germ. *über* and *um;* comp. 1 Pet. iii. 18. It is wrongly assumed by Harless that only ὑπέρ expresses in itself the relation of *care for*, and not περί. The notion of the latter—that of *encircling*—in fact sensuously embodies such *care;* hence with classical writers too, especially with Demosthenes, περί and ὑπέρ are interchanged without any difference of sense, *e.g.*[6] — ἵνα μοι δοθῇ κ.τ.λ.] *Aim* of the καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, and consequently *contents of the intercession for the apostle* (comp. on iii. 16): *in order that utterance may be given to me on the opening of my mouth, i.e.*, that there may not be withheld from me by God, but may on the contrary be conferred, that which I ought to speak when I open my mouth. That Paul means the speaking *with a view to the proclamation of the gospel*, is from the context (see ἐν παῤῥησ. γνωρ. κ.τ.λ.) clear. The emphasis, however, is upon δοθῇ, to which, in the sequel, ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ significantly corresponds; for this freedom of speech is the *consequence* wished for by Paul from that bestowal. Comp. Luke xxi. 15. As to ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα, which in itself represents nothing else than the opening of the mouth to speak, comp. on Matt. v. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 11; on the substantive ἄνοιξις, comp. Thuc. iv. 67. 3. The expression is *graphic*, and has here something of a *pathetic* nature, without, however, containing a *qualitative* feature *of the discourse itself*, not even the character of *unpremeditated* utterance,[1] which would have been expressed by ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀνοίξει τοῦ στ., or in a similar *significant* way. This at the same time in opposition to Calvin, Boyd, Zanchius, Michaelis, Zachariae, and others, including Koppe, Rückert, Matthies, Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Bleek, Schenkel, who explain: *unreservedly*, *frankly*, which would have to be attached not to what follows (see below), but closely to λόγος, and thereby, again, the ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ γνωρ. would be unwarrantably anticipated. Following Bullinger, Calovius, Cornelius à Lapide, and others,[2] Harless and Olshausen understand the ἄνοιξις τοῦ στόματος as the *act of God*,[3] holding it to denote: *the bestowed capacity of speaking in contrast to an earlier bound state of the tongue.* Paul would thus have said: "in order that utterance may be given unto me through my mouth being opened." But what needless diffuseness of expression, since δοθῇ λόγος and ἄνοιξις τοῦ στόματος would be just *the same thing!* Kypke and Koppe attach ἐν ἀνοίξειτοῦ στ. μ. to what follows; in which case Kypke regards ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ as epexegesis of ἀνοίξει τ. στ. μ., and Koppe, following Grotius,[4] refers ἐν παῤῥ. to the *outward* freedom: "non vinculis constrictus in carcere latens," "not bound by chains, concealed in prison." The latter explanation is logically erroneous, since, thus understood, ἐν παῤῥησ. would be something quite *other* than the ἄνοιξις τοῦ στόματος, and thus could not be added by way of apposition, without καί; and linguistically erroneous, since παῤῥησία never denotes outward freedom, and here especially its signification of *boldness* is rendered clear by the παῤῥησιάσωμαι of ver. 20.[5] In opposition to Kypke, it may be urged that an addition of so purely exegetical a character, as ἐν παῤῥ. would be to ἐν ἀνοίξ. τ. στόμ. u., would not be in keeping with the elevated style of the discourse, which is not couched in anything like a didactic tone. Köster,[6] with whom, in the main, Bleek agrees, attaches ἐν ἀνοίξ. τ. στόμ. μ. to what follows, and takes δοθῇ λόγος in the well-known classical sense: *to allow one to come to speech*, to let him speak;[7] so that Paul is supposed to say: "that opportunity to speak may be given to me, namely, at the opening of my mouth (that is, when I wish to speak) frankly to proclaim," etc. But even in this way ἐν ἀνοίξει τοῦ στόμ. μου. would be only a needless and cumbrous addition. — ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ γνωρίσαι κ.τ.λ.] *with frankness to make known the mystery of the gospel, i.e.*, the mystery (see on i. 9) which forms the *contents* of the gospel. The opportunity of preaching was not taken from the apostle in his captivity at Caesarea (Acts xxiv. 23), nor yet afterwards at Rome (Acts xxviii. 30 f.). Should we attach ἐν παῤῥ. to what precedes,[1] γνωρίσαι would be without a necessary modal definition.

---

[1] See on ver. 22; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* iii. 10. 14; Stallb. *ad Plat. Rep.* ii. p. 362 D.

[2] Comp. Koppe.

[3] Comp. Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc.* p. xxxviii f.

[4] See Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 11, 713.

[5] See Schaefer, *App. ad Dem.* I. p. 190; Buttmann, *Ind. ad Mid.* p. 188.

[6] *Phil.* ii. p. 74, 35: μὴ περὶ τῶν δικαίων μηδ' ὑπὲρ τῶν ἔξω πραγμάτων εἶναι τὴν βουλήν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ, 10. 16: οὐ περι δόξης οὐδ' ὑπὲρ μέρους χώρας πολεμοῦσι, Xen. *Mem.* i. 1. 17: ὑπὲρ τούτων περὶ αὐτοῦ παραγνῶναι, Thucyd. vi. 78. 1: ὑπέρ γε τῆς ἐμῆς κινδυνεύειν, ἐνθυμηθήτωὲ οὐ περὶ τῆς ἐμῆς μᾶλλον.

---

[1] Oecumenius: ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἀνοῖξαι ὁ λόγος προήει, "in the very opening, the word went forth."

[2] Grotius also regards the ἄνοιξις τοῦ στόματος as the act of God: "sic Deus labia aperire dicitur, ubi materiam suppeditat sibi gratias agendi, 'Thus God is said to open the lips when he supplies the matter for thanksgiving,' Ps. li. 15," yet makes out of it, after the Rabbinical פתחון פה (see Capell. *Spicileg.* p. 112; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 1872), *occasione* (loquendi) *data*, "the opportunity to speak being given." But the sense, "*opportunity to speak*," could only so be brought out in the event of the words running thus: ἵνα μοι δοθῇ ἄνοιξις τοῦ στόματός μου.

[3] Comp. Ezek. iii. 27, xxix. 31, xxxii. 22; Ps. li. 17.

[4] "Ut ab hac custodia militari liber per omnem urbem perferre possem sermonem evang.," "That free from this military guard, I may carry the tidings of the gospel throughout the entire city," etc.

[5] Comp. Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. *in* 2 *Cor.* p. 99 f.

[6] In the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 317.

[7] Dem. 26, 18; 27, 9; 508, 16; 1220, 20; comp. λόγου τυχεῖν, 229, 13.

REMARK.—If the *Recepta* δοθείη were genuine, the statement of aim, introduced by ἵνα, would be adduced *from the mind of the persons praying*, thus in the character of the *oratio obliqua*. See on i. 17.

Ver. 20. *For which* (to conduct its cause) *I discharge the office of ambassador in a chain.* Comp. on 2 Cor. v. 20. It is to be explained neither as though ὑπὲρ οὗ πρεσβεύων ἐν ἀλύσει εἰμί, "for which discharging the office of ambassador, I am in a chain,"[2] were written, nor as though ὑπὲρ οὗ καὶ ἐν ἀλύσει πρεσβεύω, "for which and in a chain, I am discharging the office of ambassador," were the reading;[3] nor is οὗ to be referred, as is *usually* the case, merely to τοῦ εὐαγγελ, but to τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγ., seeing that this was the object of γνωρίσαι, and to this γνωρίσαι the πρεσβείω significantly corresponds. Comp. Col. iv. 3: λαλῆσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' ὃ καὶ δέδεμαι. — πρεσβεύω] *whose* ambassador he is, was at once understood by the reader, namely, *Christ's;* and equally so *to whom* his embassy was addressed, namely, to all peoples, specially the Gentiles (Acts ix. 15, xxii. 15; Rom. i. 14, xi. 13; Gal. ii. 9). The opinion of Michaelis, that Paul designates himself as delegate of Christ *to the Roman court*, would, even if he had written the Epistle in Rome, be imported, since no reader could find anything else than *the apostle* denoted by πρεσβεύω without more precise definition. — ἐν ἀλύσει] On ἐν, comp. phrases like εἰς τὴν ἅλυσιν ἐμπίπτειν, Polyb. xxi. 3. 3. Wetstein, we may add, aptly observes: "alias legati, jure gentium sancti et inviolabiles, in vinculis haberi non poterant," "in other relations ambassadors sacred and inviolable by the law of nations, could not be held in bonds." To infer, however, from the use of the singular[4] the *custodia militaris*, "the military custody," in which Paul was *at Rome* (Acts xxviii. 20; 2 Tim. i. 16), is too hasty; partly for the general reason that the singular must by no means be urged, but may be taken collectively,[5] and partly for the special reason that we have to think of Paul at Caesarea too, and that from the very beginning of his captivity there (see on Acts xxiv. 23), as in the *custodia militaris*, "military custody;" Acts xxiv. 27, xxvi. 29.[6] The *significant bearing* of the addition *ἐν ἀλύσει* is to make palpable the so much greater *need* of the *παῤῥησία*, and so the more fully to justify the longing for the intercessory prayer of the readers. — *ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ παῤῥησ. ὡς δεῖ με λαλ.*] *Parallel* to the *ἵνα μοι δοθῇ . . . εὐαγγελίου*, ver. 19, and indeed not tautological,[1] but, by means of *ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι*, *more precisely defining* the thought already expressed. As similar parallels by means of a second *ἵνα*, comp. Rom. vii. 13 ; Gal. iii. 14 ; 1 Cor. xii. 20 ; 2 Cor. ix. 3. Harless regards this second *ἵνα* as *subordinate* to the first. Thus the words would express not the aim *on account of which Paul summons his readers to prayer*, as stated by Harless, but the aim of the *δοθῇ λόγος κ.τ.λ.* But this would be inappropriate, since *δοθῇ λόγος κ.τ.λ.* *has* already the definition of aim appropriate to it, namely, in *ἐν παῤῥ. γνωρ. κ.τ.λ.* Bengel and Meier make *ἵνα* dependent on *πρεσβεύω ἐν ἀλύσει* (in which case Meier imports the sense, as if the words were *ἵνα καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ παῤῥ.*) ; but the clause expressive of the aim : "in order that I may therein speak as boldly *as I am bound to speak*," does not logically correspond to the *πρεσβεύω ἐν ἀλύσει*, because without any reference to *ἐν ἀλύσει*. Had Paul merely written : *ἵνα παῤῥησιάσωμαι ἐν αὐτῷ* (without *ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι*), by which the *παῤῥησ.* would have become emphatic,[2] or : *ἵνα πολλῷ μᾶλλον παῤῥησ. ἐν αὐτῷ*, the logical relation would be satisfied. — *ἐν αὐτῷ*] namely, *in the mystery of the gospel*, *i.e.*, occupied therewith, in the proclamation thereof.[3] Comp. Acts ix. 27. Harless understands *ἐν* of the *source* or *ground* of the *παῤῥησία*, which has its basis in the message itself [rather : in the mystery of the gospel ; see on *ὑπὲρ οὗ*]. But the context represents the *μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγ.* as the *object* of the bold discourse (ver. 19) ; and the *source* of the *παῤῥησία* is in *God* (see 1 Thess. ii. 2), which is not indeed here expressed, but is implied in the fact that it is to be *obtained* for the apostle *by prayer* on the part of the readers. — *ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι*] to be taken *together* (comp. Col. iv. 4) ; and after *με* there is not to be put any comma, by which *λαλῆσαι* would be connected with *παῤῥησ.*,[4]—a course, which is impossible just because *παῤῥησ.* already expresses the bold *speaking ;* and thus *λαλῆσαι*, if it were to be more precisely defining, could not but of necessity have with it a modal definition (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 2).[5]

---

[1] Vatablus: "ut detur mihi aperto ore loqui libere, ut notum faciam," "that it may be given me to speak freely with open mouth, that I may make known," etc.

[2] Zachariae, Rückert, Matthies.

[3] Grotius: "nunc quoque non desino legationem," "now also I do not cease my embassy," etc.

[4] Baumgarten, Paley, Flatt, Steiger.

[5] Bernhardy, p. 58 f.

[6] In the latter passage the plural τῶν δεσμ. τούτων is not at variance with this view, as

Ver. 21. *Δέ*] Serving to make the transition to another subject. — *καὶ ὑμεῖς*] *ye also*, not merely the Colossians, Col. iv. 8, 9.[6] While most of the older expositors pass over this *καί* in silence,[7] Rückert and Matthies strangely enough think that it stands *in contradistinction to the apostle himself.* From this there would in fact result the absurd thought : "in order that not only I, but also ye may know how it fares with me." — *τὰ κατ' ἐμέ*] *my circumstances*, *my position*, Phil. i. 22 ; Col. iv. 7.[8] — *τί πράσσω*] more precise definition of *τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* : *what I experience.* i.e., *how it fares with me*, *how I find my-*

---

it is rather the *categoric* plural, and leaves the question entirely undecided, whether Paul was bound with one or more chains.

[1] In opposition to Harless.

[2] This seems also to have been felt by Bengel, who connected *ὡς δεῖ με λαλ.* with *γνωρίσαι*, which certainly could not occur to any reader.

[3] Matthiae, p. 1342.

[4] Koppe.

[5] See Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. *in* 2 *Cor.* p. 100 f.

[6] See Introd. § 2.

[7] Rightly, however, explained in a general sense by Bengel : "perinde ut alii," "just as others."

[8] See Kühner, II. p. 119.

self.[1] So often also in classical writers, "de statu et rebus, in quibus quis constitutus est et versatur," "of the condition and affairs wherein any one is placed and is occupied," Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. 629.[2] — Τύχικος] See Acts xx. 4; Col. iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 12. Beyond these passages unknown. — ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφὸς καί πιστ. διάκ. ἐν κυρ.] So Paul characterizes Tychicus *by way of commendation*,[3] and that (*a*) as his beloved fellow-Christian, and (*b*) as his faithful official servant. As the latter, he was employed by Paul for just such journeys as the present. Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 12. Mark likewise, according to 2 Tim. iv. 11, receives from the apostle the testimony that he is for him εὔχρηστος εἰς διακονίαν. *Others*, like Grotius (comp. Calvin), do not refer διάκονος to the relation to the apostle, but explain it: *servant of the gospel* [minister evangelii], while Estius and many understand specially the *ecclesiastical office of the deacon.* But Col. iv. 7, where διάκονος καὶ σύνδουλος are united (the latter word *softening* the relation of service towards the apostle expressed by διάκονος), speaks in favor of our view. — ἐν κυρίῳ] belongs only to διάκονος, not to ἀδελφός as well (in opposition to Meier and Harless), since only the former had need of a specific definition (comp. on Phil. i. 14), in order to be brought out in its true relation (and not to bear the semblance of harshness). Not beyond the pale of Christian relations was Tychicus *servant* of the apostle, but *in Christ* his service was carried on, Christ was the sphere of the same, inasmuch as Tychicus was *official* διάκονος of the apostle. ἐν κυρίῳ is attached without an article, because combined with διάκονος so as to form one idea.

Ver. 22. Ἔπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς] namely, that he should travel from Colossae to you, Col. iv. 7–9.[4] — εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο] *in this very design.*[5] — ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν] must on account of εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο necessarily convey the same thing as was said by ἵνα εἰδῆτε τὰ κατ' ἐμέ, τί πράσσω, ver. 21; hence the conjecture of Rückert, ἵνα γνῷ τε τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν, is entirely baseless; and at Col. iv. 8 also we have, in accordance with preponderant evidence, to read ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν. — By ἡμῶν Paul means *himself and those that are with him* (see Col. iv. 10 ff.; Philem. 10 f., 23 ff.), concerning whom information was likewise reserved for the report of Tychicus. — παρακαλέσῃ] *might comfort.* For Tychicus had to tell of sufferings and afflictions which Paul must needs endure (comp. ver. 20), and on account of them the readers were called μὴ ἐκκακεῖν, iii. 13. Amplifications of the notion[6] are arbitrary.

Ver. 23 f. Twofold wish of blessing at the close, in which, however, Paul does not, as in the closing formulae of the other Epistles, directly address the readers (μεθ' ὑμῶν, μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν, μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν). This variation is to be regarded as merely *accidental*, and the more so, seeing that he *has* in fact been just addressing his readers directly, and seeing that a μεθ' ὑμῶν or the like would simply address the readers, as has so often been done in the Epistle itself, leaving, we may add, the question, *who* these readers are, in itself wholly undetermined. For what is asserted by Grotius on ver. 24 : "*Non Ephesios tantum salutat, sed et omnes in Asia Christianos*," "He salutes not only the Ephesians, but also all Christians in Asia," is not implied in τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς—which, on the contrary, *represents* quite the simple ὑμῖν, inasmuch as Paul conceives of the recipients of the Epistle in *the third person*. According to Wieseler, p. 444 f., the apostle in ver. 23 salutes the Jewish Christians (ἀδελφ.), and in ver. 24 the Gentile Christians (πάντων) in Ephesus. Improbable in itself, more particularly in *this* Epistle, which so carefully brings into prominence the unity of the two ; and the alleged distinguishing reference would neither be recognizable, nor in keeping with the apostolic wisdom. — εἰρήνη] not *concordia*, "*harmony*," as recommended by Calvin,[1] but, as Calvin himself explains : *welfare, blessing*, שָׁלוֹם, without more precise definition, because it takes the place of the *valete* (ἔῤῥωσθε, Acts xv. 29) at the close of our Epistle,[2] and because that special sense is not at all suggested from the contents of the Epistle (comp. on the other hand, 2 Cor. xiii. 11). — ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως] is *one* object of the wish for blessing, not two. After the general *fare well!* namely, Paul singles out further the highest *moral* element, which he wishes for his readers. He does not, however, write καὶ ἀγάπη καὶ πίστις, because with good reason he presupposes faith (in the atonement achieved by Christ) as already present, but has doubtless to wish for them that which, as the constant life of faith, is to be combined with it (1 Cor. xiii. ; Gal. v. 6), Christian brotherly love, consequently *love* with faith (ἀγάπη has the emphasis, not μετὰ πίστ.).[3] Bengel and Meier understand the *divine* love, to which, however, μετὰ πίστ. is unsuitable, although Meier explains it : *in conformity with their own faith*, partly at variance with linguistic usage,[4] partly importing a thought (*their own*). The reading ἔλεος (instead of ἀγάπη) is to be regarded simply as a glossematic consequence of the explaining it of the *divine* love, and yet, though found *only* in codex A, it is held by Rückert to be the true one (comp. Gal. vi. 16) ; Paul, he says, wishes to the readers εἰρήνη κ. ἔλεος *for the reward* (?) of faith. — ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς κ. κυρ. 'Ι. Χ.] See on Rom. i. 7. Grotius, we may add, rightly observes : "conjungit causam principem cum causa secunda,"

---

[1] Others, like Wolf: what I *am doing*. But *that* the reader knew. He was doing the *one* thing, which always occupied him. See vv. 19, 20.

[2] Comp. Ael. *V. H.* ii. 35, where the sick Gorgias is asked τί πράττοι. Plato, *Theaet.* p. 174 B; Soph. *Oed. R.* 74; and see Wetstein and Kypke.

[3] The assumption of a more special design as regards πιστός, namely, that it is meant to represent Tychicus as a *trustworthy* reporter (Grotius), is inadmissible, because Tychicus without doubt was known to the readers (Acts xx. 4). It was otherwise in relation to the Colossians. See on Col. iv. 7.

[4] See Introd. § 2.

[5] See on ver. 18, and Bornemann, *ad Xen. Mem.* iii. 12. 2; Pflugk, *ad Eur. Androm.* 41.

[6] Rückert: "to elevate by address to them of every kind;" Baumgarten-Crusius: *to strengthen;* comp. Estius, who proposes *exhortetur*, "to exhort."

---

[1] "Quia mox fit dilectionis mentio," "because afterwards there is mention of love ;" comp. also Theodore and Oecumenius.

[2] Hence also not to be explained of *the*, *peace of reconciliation* (Bengel, Matthies, Schenkel, and others), any more here than in the *opening* salutations of the Epistle, where it takes the place of the epistolary *salutem*, εὖ πράττειν.

[3] Comp. Plato, *Phaed.* p. 253 E : κάλλος μετὰ ὑγιείας λαμβάνειν.

[4] μετά may, it is true, sometimes be approximately as to sense rendered by *conformably to*, but the analysis in those cases is such as does *not* suit our passage. See *e.g.* Dem. *Lept.* p. 490 ; Plato, *Phaed.* p. 66 B, where μετὰ τῶν νόμων and μετὰ τοῦ λόγου is to be explained, *in connection with* the laws, etc., *i.e.*, *with the aid* of the same. Comp. also Thucyd. iii. 82. 5, and Krüger *in loc.* See in general, Bernhardy, p. 255.

"He joins the first with the second cause."[1] For Christ is exalted on the part of God to the government of the world, and particularly to the Lordship of the church (i. 22 ; Phil. ii. 9) ; and His dominion has in God, the Head of Christ (1 Cor. xi. 3), not merely its ground (comp. also Eph. i. 17), but also its goal (1 Cor. iii. 23, xv. 28).

Ver. 24. While Paul has in ver. 23 expressed his wish of blessing for the *readers* (*τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς*), he now annexes thereto a further such general wish, namely, *for all who love Christ imperishably*, just as at 1 Cor. xvi. 22 he takes up into the closing wish an *ἀνάθεμα* upon all those who do *not* love Christ. —*ἡ χάρις*] the grace *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, "pre-eminently," *i.e.*, the grace of God in Christ. Comp. Col. iv. 18 ; 1 Tim. vi. 21 ; 2 Tim. iv. 22 ; Tit. iii. 15. In the conclusion of other Epistles : the grace of Christ, Rom. xvi. 20, 24 ; 1 Cor. xvi. 23 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 13 ; Gal. vi. 18 ; Phil. iv. 23 ; Thess. v. 28 ; 2 Thess. iii. 18 ; Phil. 25. —*ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ*] belongs neither 1 to *'Ιησοῦν Χριστόν*,[2] nor to *ἡ χάρις*,[3] nor yet to the *sit*, "be," to be supplied after *ἡ χάρις*, as is held, after Beza (who, however, took *ἐν* for *εἰς*) and Bengel, recently by Matthies,[4] Harless,[5] Bleek, and Olshausen, which last supposes a *breviloquentia*, "an abbreviated expression," for *ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχωσιν ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ*, *i.e.*, *ζωὴν αἰώνιον*. But, in opposition to Matthies, it may be urged that the purely temporal notion *eternity* (*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*) is foisted upon the word *imperishableness ;* and in opposition to Harless, that the abstract notion *imperishableness* is transmuted into the concrete notion of *imperishable being*, which is not the meaning of *ἀφθαρσ.*, even in 2 Tim. i. 10 (but imperishableness *in abstracto*, "in the abstract"), and that *ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ*, instead of adding, in accordance with its emphatic position, a very weighty and important element, would express something which is self-evident, namely, that according to the wish of the apostle the grace might display itself not *ἐν φθαρτοῖς* (1 Pet. i. 18), but *ἐν ἀφθάρτοις* ; the *breviloquentia*, "abbreviated expression," lastly, assumed by Olshausen is, although *ἀφθαρσ.* in itself might be equivalent to *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*,[6] a pure invention, the sense of which Paul would have expressed by *εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν*. The *right* connection is the *usual* one, namely, with *ἀγαπώντων*. And in accordance with this, we have to explain it : *who love the Lord in imperishableness*, i.e., *so that their love does not pass away*, in which case *ἐν* expresses the manner. Comp. the concluding wish Tit. iii. 15, where *ἐν πίστει* is in like manner to be combined with *φιλοῦντας*. *Others*, following the same connection, have understood the *sinceritas*, "sincerity," either of the love itself[7] or of the disposition and the life in general,[1] but against this Beza has already with reason urged the linguistic usage; for *uncorruptedness* is not ἀφθαρσία (not even in Wisd. vi. 18, 19), but ἀφθορία (Tit. ii. 7) and ἀδιαφθορία (Wetstein, II. p. 373). On ἀφθαρσία, *imperishableness* (at 1 Cor. xv. 42, 52, it is in accordance with the context specially *incorruptibility*), comp. Plut. *Arist.* 6; Rom. ii. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 25; 1 Tim. i. 17; 2 Tim. i. 10; Wisd. ii. 23, vi. 18 f.; 4 Macc. ix. 22, xvii. 12.

---

[1] The order in the combination of the two causes is inverted in Gal. *l.c.: διὰ 'Ιησοῦ Χρ. καὶ Θεοῦ πατρός.*

[2] Wetstein : "Christum immortalem et gloriosum, non humilem," "Christ immortal and glorious, not humble," etc.; see also Reiners in Wolf and Semler.

[3] "Favor immortalis," "immortal favor," Castalio, Drusius ; comp. Piscator and Michaelis, who take *ἐν* as equivalent to *σύν*, while the latter supposes a reference to deniers of the resurrection !

[4] "That grace with all . . . *may be in eternity ;* comp. Baumgarten-Crusius."

[5] According to whom *ἐν* denotes the element in which the *χάρις* manifests itself, and *ἀφθαρσ.* is all imperishable being, whether appearing in this life or in eternity.

[6] See Grimm, *Handb.* p. 60.

[7] Pelagius, Anselm, Calvin, Calovius, and others.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

LVII. Ver. 1. Τὰ τέκνα κ.τ.λ.

Stier, Braune and Philippi agree here with Hofmann, over against Meyer; but emphasis cannot be thrown on either side. Attention, however, to another point, noted by Eadie and Braune, is important, viz., the clear implication of the presence of children at the public worship, where this epistle was to be read.

LVIII. Ver. 4. ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νουθεσίᾳ.

The Revised version translates: "In the chastening and admonition of the Lord." Trench, following Grotius, and followed by most English writers, rejects the distinction advocated by Meyer, and defines the former as "training by act and discipline," and the latter as 'training by word." "For the Greeks, παιδεία was simply 'education;' nor in all the many definitions of παιδεία, which are to be found in Plato, is there so much as the slightest prophetic anticipation of the new force which the word should obtain. But the deeper apprehension of those who had learned that 'foolishness is bound in the heart' alike 'of a child' and of a man, while yet the 'rod of correction may drive it far from him' (Prov. xxii. 15), led them, in assuming the word, to bring into it a further thought, they felt and understood that all effectual instruction for the sinful children of men includes and implies chastening, or, as we are accustomed to say, out of a sense of the same truth 'correction.'" Yet, as Barry suggests, the authority of the father in this, as allowed under the Roman law, is here softened by the addition of the κυρίου. In the discipline, the fact must be remembered that they belong to Christ, "taken into His arms, and sealed as His little ones." This intensifies infinitely "the greatest reverence due a child," of which Juvenal wrote.

Cremer defines νουθεσία by "well-intentioned, but serious correction," and adds: "This *putting right*, or *correction*, just as the Lord uses it, is opposed to wrath, Wisd. xvi. 5, 6, xi. 11; and the admonition answers to what precedes μὴ παροργίζετε κ.τ.λ., for παροργίζειν, *to imitate, to provoke to wrath*, implies and presupposes one's own anger. Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 14. Παιδεία and νουθεσία alike have as their end the ἄνθρωπος τέλειος, Col. i. 28; Eph. iv. 13, but νουθεσία is intended to obviate deviations, and to establish the right direction of the παιδεία" (Lexicon, p. 442). See Martensen's Social Ethics, pp. 62 sq.

---

[1] Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Erasmus, Flacius, Estius, Zeger, Grotius: "significatur is, qui nulla vi, nullis precibus, nullis illecebris se corrumpi, *i.e.*, *a recto abduci*, patitur," "That is indicated which by no force, no enticements, allows itself to be corrupted, *i.e.*, *to be withdrawn from the right*," and others, including Wieseler.

LIX. Ver. 12. *ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.*

Again, as in chap. i. 3, ii. 2 (see Notes III., XVII.), we cannot appreciate the argument for a local restriction. The contrast here is between the weakness of man and the strength of his great enemies, and the apostle's idea is fully expressed by interpreting this as meaning "of a sphere higher than that of earth." The inference from the other constructions that would have been used for this is scarcely in point here. "The latent opposition *αἷμα καὶ σὰρξ* (on earth) and *τὰ πνευμ.* (in supernal regions), suggests a word of greater antithetical force, which still *can* include the same lexical meaning. As in chap. ii. 2, there was no reason for limiting the term to the mere physical *atmosphere*, so here still less need we adopt any more precise specification of locality" (Ellicott). Barry adds another element, well worthy of note : It "surely points to the power of evil as directly spiritual, not acting through physical and human agency, but attacking the spirit in that higher aspect, in which it contemplates heavenly things and ascends to the communion with God."

LX. Ver. 13. *τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πονηρᾷ.*

These words are not those of a mere man, mistaken in his inference concerning an approaching crisis, as Meyer's interpretation implies, but they are inspired of the Holy Ghost, and refer to a contest through which it was unerringly foreseen that the readers of this epistle were to pass.

LXI. Ver. 14. *τῆς δικαιοσύνης.*

Ellicott concurs with Meyer, defining the thought better, viz., "the righteousness which is the result of the renovation of the heart by the Holy Spirit." But is there actually a tautology involved by interpreting it as referring to the righteousness of Christ? Faith and its righteousness, however closely united, are nevertheless different things, and thus understood, there is no anticipation. Besides, without tautology, Paul elsewhere speaks of faith as both the means and the fruit of justification. Braune makes "the righteousness" refer to both that of faith and of life. We prefer, with Eadie, following Harless, to understand it of "justification by the blood of the cross." "To every insinuation that they are so vile, guilty, worthless and perverse—so beset with sin and under such wrath that God will repulse them, they oppose the free and perfect righteousness of their Redeemer, which is 'upon them,' Rom. iii. 22. So that the dart thrown at them only rings against such a cuirass, and falls blunted to the earth."

LXII. Ver. 18. *ἐν πνεύματι.*

Schmidt inserts in revised Meyer, Hofmann's explanation, that the expression refers to prayer as such as should be a constant occupation of the spiritual life, and is never a mere outward activity, such as in chap. v. 18, to which the semblance of prayer by the natural man must be limited. *ἐν πνεύματι* is understood then as referring to the Holy Spirit in His relation to the human spirit.

TOPICAL INDEX.

A.

Adoption, 315.
Age, Present, The, 358.
Ajasaluk, 287.
Angels, The, and redemption, 326 seq., 353 ; classes of, 343 seq.; recognizing God's wisdom, 414 seq.
Anger, Warned against, 478 seq.; righteous, 487.
Application in the Christian calling, 503 seq.
Armor, The Christian's, 542 seq., 547.
Artemis, 287.
Ascension of Christ, The, 449, 485.
Atonement, The, of Christ, 314, 351 seq., 317, 352, 368, 490 seq.; consequence of, 357, 384 seq., 387 seq., 389 seq.

B.

Baptism, 440 ; its cleansing influence, 513 seq.
Basil on Ephesians, 288 seq.
Believers, Christian, alive in Christ, 369 ; saved by grace, 370 ; exalted with Christ, 371 ; in God's kingdom, 392 seq.; as the dwelling of the Holy Spirit, 397 seq.; grounded in love, 424 seq.; knowing Christ's love, 425 seq., 432 seq.; filled with God, 427 seq.; receiving the gifts of grace, 443 ; progressing in faith and knowledge, 456 seq.; their goal, 459 ; their head in Christ, 463 ; exhorted to a pure walk, 467 seq.; warned against heathen vices, 469 seq., 491 seq.; admonished to spiritual regeneration, 475 seq.; exhorted to moral life and conduct, 477 seq.; exhorted to love, 490 seq.; as children of light, 495 ; to redeem the time, 503 seq.; warned against debauchery, 505 ; exhorted to social worship, 506 seq.; to be sanctified, 512 seq.; members of Christ's body, 518 seq.; admonished to be strong in the Lord, 535 seq.; to put on God's armor, 536 seq.; to pray always, 548 seq., 558 ; receive Paul's benediction, 554 seq.
Benediction bestowed, 554 seq.
Bitterness reproved, 483.
Buffoonery condemned, 492, 524.

C.

Children, their obedience to parents, 529 seq.; their baptism, 529 ; their presence at public worship, 557 ; their training, 532, 557.
Church, The, as Christ's body, 345 seq., 464 seq.; as united in Christ, 396 seq., 465 seq.; its holiness, 397 seq.; as one community, 416, 431 ; its progressive development, 466 seq.; subject to Christ, 509 seq.; sanctified by Christ, 512 seq ; to be glorified, 514 seq.
Christ, His blessings, 312 ; His adoption, 315 ; His grace, 317 ; His redemption, 317 seq., 352, 490 seq.; union with Christ, 320 ; sent by God, 321, 352; His resurrection, 341 seq., 369 seq. ; His glorified body, 342 seq., 353 seq.; His exaltation and dominion, 342 seq., 371, 452; filling the church, 346 seq.; His divinity, 351 seq.; as our peace, 382 seq.; His atonement, 384 seq.; and the law, 385 seq.; reconciling man to God, 387 seq.; preaching peace, 390 seq.; as the corner-stone, 394 seq.; the ground of salvation, 417 ; dwelling in the believers, 423 seq.; His love, 425 ; overcoming His enemies, 448 ; His ascension and decension, 449 seq.; the head of believers, 463 ; calling the believers, 502 seq.; the aim of His death, 512 seq.; His love to the church, 516.
Circumcision, 377.
Colossians, Epistle to the, 301 seq.
Commandment with promise, The, 530 seq.
Communicatio idiomatum, The doctrine of the, 354.
Confidence, Spiritual, 417.

Conflict, The Christian's, 537 seq.
Conversion, its order, 331; man's part in, 425 seq., 422 seq.; its necessity, 475 seq.
Covenants of promise, 379.
Covetousness, 470; excludes from the kingdom, 493.

D.

Debauchery condemned, 505.
Demons, The, and their habitation, 359 seq., 399; their power, 538 seq., 557 seq.
Depravity, Natural, 367 seq.
Descent into Hades of Christ, 450, 485.
Devil, The, 450, 538 seq.
Devils, The, and their restoration, 326; their food and dwelling-place, 361, 399; their influence and power, 538 seq., 557 seq.
Discourse, Evil, reproved, 481 seq.
Doxology, A, 429 seq.

E.

Edification in speech, 482.
Election, Divine, 313 seq., 351 seq.
Encouragement, Spiritual, 418 seq., 422 seq.
Endowments, Spiritual, 418 seq., 422.
Enlightenment, Christian, 337 seq.
Enmity between Jew and Gentile, 383 seq.
Ephesians, Epistle to the, 287 seq.; its address, 287 seq.; place of composition, 299 seq.; time of composition, 300 seq.; its genuineness, 302 seq.; its dependence on Colossians, 303 seq.; its occasion, object, and contents, 307 seq.
Ephesus, 287.

F.

Faith and salvation, 372 seq.; as instrumental cause, 417; its unity, 440; its aim, 456 seq.; saving, 545.
Fathers, their duty to children, 532 seq.
Forbearance, 437 seq.
Foreknowledge of God, 313 seq., 351 seq.
Forgiveness of sins, 318, 352; mutual, 483.

G.

Gentile gods, 380.
Gentiles, The, in God's kingdom, 392, 410 seq.; blessed, 406 seq.; their irreligious condition, 468 seq.; their ignorance, 469, 486; their lasciviousness, 470 seq., 496 seq.
Glory of Messianic salvation, The, 340, 379; of God, 422 seq.
Gnosticism, 350.
Good Works and salvation, 373 seq.; and justification, 376, 400.
Gospel, The, and salvation, 330 seq.
God, the Father, 311 seq., 350 seq.; His foreknowledge and election, 313 seq., 351 seq., 416 seq.; His judgment, 314; His love, 314 seq., 368 seq.; His administration, 321 seq., 352 seq.; awakens to spiritual life, 356 seq.; his wrath, 364 seq.; as the Creator, 413 seq.; as the universal Father, 419 seq., 431 seq.; His glory, 422 seq.; praise to, 429 seq.; unity of, 442 seq.; renews man, 475 seq.; His call to the sleepers, 500.
Grace, its glory, 317; its saving power, 328 seq., 369, 372 seq.

H.

Holiness, 314, 351 seq.
Hope, Christian, 340 seq.
Holy Spirit, The, received. 331, 353; His working, 337; dwelling in the believers, 397 seq.; strengthening the inner man, 423; unity in, 439 seq.; renewing man, 475 seq.; grieved, 482 seq.; the fruits of, 495 seq.; the sword of, 547.
Humility, 412.
Husband and wife, 508 seq.; love of the former, 516 seq.; ground of their union, 519 seq.

I.

Immorality, 358.
Infant Baptism, 366. seq.
Instability, Religious, 460 seq.

J.

Jerome on Ephesians, 289.
Justification and good works, 376, 400.

K.

Kingdom, Messianic, The, 327 seq.
Knowledge, Christian, 338 seq., 353; of Christ, 457 seq.

L.

Labor commended, 481.
Law, The, and Christ, 385 seq.
Laodiceans, Epistle to the, 294 seq.
Lord's Supper, The, 440; an act of preserved unity, 484; reference to, 515, 519, 526.
Love, Divine, 314 seq., 368 seq.; man exhorted to, 490 seq.

M.

Malice condemned, 483.
Man, The Inner, 428.
Marcion on Ephesians, 289 seq.
Marriage state, 519 seq.
Masters, their duty to servants, 534 seq.
Mercy of God, The, 368 seq.
Messianic predictions realized, 445 seq.
Metic, Greek, The, 392, 401.
Monogamy, 523.
Mystery, The Divine, 413 ; a great, 522.

O.

Onesimus, 300.
Original Sin, 365 seq., 399 seq.

P.

Parousia, The, 324, 371 seq., 430 ; and the believer's goal, 459 ; the church of Christ in, 515.
Paul as a prisoner, 299 seq. ; for the Gentiles' sake, 405 seq. ; as receiving revelations, 406 ; receiving spiritual gifts, 411 seq. ; supplicates the Father, 419 seq. ; desires the believer's prayers, 549 seq. ; his preaching powers, 551 seq. ; as ambassador of Christ, 552 seq. ; sends Tychicus, 554 ; imparts his blessing, 554 seq.
Peace of the Gospel, The, 543 seq.
Philemon, 301.
Praise to God, 311 seq., 334 seq.
Prayer, Intercessory, 335 seq., 549 ; as a Christian habit, 548 seq., 558 ; the object of, 550 seq.
Predestination, 313 seq., 351 seq. ; through love, 314 seq., 316, 352 ; its final cause, 328 seq.
Promises of God, 331 seq.
Prophecy fulfilled, 443 seq.
Psalm quoted, 443 seq.

R.

Recompense, Spiritual, 534.
Redemption in Christ, 317 seq., 352, 333 ; the eternal plan of, 414.
Regeneration, 475 seq.
Restoration, 325 seq.
Restitution, 324 seq.
Resurrection of Christ, The, 341 seq., 369 seq.
Righteousness, Forensic, 314, 352 seq. ; as moral rectitude, 543, 558.

S.

Salutation, Apostolic, 310 ; the glory of, 340.
Salvation of God, 328 seq.; by grace, 369, 372 seq. ; of the Messianic kingdom, 546 seq.
Sanctification the aim of Christ's sacrifice, 512, 525.
Servants, their duty, 532 seq.
Sealing with the Spirit, 331, 353.
Sin, Dead unto, 357 ; original, 365 seq., 399 seq. ; to be exposed, 498.
Stealing forbidden, 480.
Subjection of all things to Christ, 344 seq.

T.

Tertullian on Ephesians, 289 seq.
Thanksgiving commended, 507 seq.
Theocracy, The, 444.
Trinity, The, 442.
Truth in love, 462 ; in Christ, 472 seq.
Truthfulness commended, 477 seq.
Tychicus, 300.

U.

Ubiquity of Christ's body, 346 seq., 353 seq.
Unchastity, warned against, 491 ; excludes from the kingdom, 493 ; of the heathen, 496 seq.
Union in Christ, 320.
Unity in the Spirit, 438 seq.; of the faith, 440; its aim, 456 seq.

W.

Wall of partition, 382 seq.
Wife and husband, 508 seq. ; ground of their union, 519 seq.; their mutual love and reverence, 523.
Wine, its excessive use condemned, 505.
Wisdom, Divine, 319 ; recognized, 414 seq.; known through the church, 416.
Word of God, The, 547.
Works and salvation, 373 seq. ; and justification, 376, 400.
Worship, Social, 506 seq.
Wrath of God, The, 364 seq.; visited upon immorality, 494.